TIMOTHY TO PETER

TIMOTHY
H. H. HARVEY, D.D.

TITUS
H. H. HARVEY, D.D.

PHILEMON
H. H. HARVEY, D.D.

HEBREWS
A. C. KENDRICK, D.D., L.L.D.

JAMES
E. T. WINKLER, D.D.

PETER
N. M. WILLIAMS, D.D.

FAMILY OF FAITH LIBRARY
0000 0252

Property of
FAMILY OF FAITH
LIBRARY

DATE DUE

AN

AMERICAN COMMENTARY

ON THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

EDITED BY

ALVAH HOVEY, D.D., LL.D.

Property of
FAMILY OF FAITH
LIBRARY

PHILADELPHIA
THE AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY
1701-1703 CHESTNUT STREET

Family of Faith Library

COMMENTARY

ON THE

PASTORAL EPISTLES,

FIRST AND SECOND TIMOTHY AND TITUS;

AND THE

EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

BY

H. HARVEY, D. D.

PHILADELPHIA

THE AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY

1701–1703 Chestnut Street

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1890, by the
AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

Printed in U. S. A.

PREFACE.

In preparing these notes on the Pastoral Epistles and the Epistle to Philemon, I have made the version of King James the basis, in accordance with the general plan of this work, but have also consulted throughout the Revised Version. While all the later Greek texts have been carefully examined, I have found my own judgment best satisfied with that of Westcott and Hort; and this for the most part has been followed. On passages where the reading is still in doubt, I have given a detailed statement of the critical materials for forming a judgment only on the more important; for, while it is sometimes of interest to the general student to know what is the reading in the more celebrated ancient manuscripts, it remains true that only a trained specialist is really competent to form a valuable judgment in textual criticism. In the commentary each paragraph is prefaced by an outline of the thought. and the notes are often accompanied by a full translation or paraphrase of the verse or passage under consideration, designed to indicate the writer's view of the exact meaning. I have throughout supplemented my own interpretation by citing the interpretations of commentators, both ancient and modern, whose proved ability, scholarship, and spiritual insight have given permanent value to their views. This has been done freely, on the supposition that this work will come into the hands of many to whom the writings of these commentators are not accessible, and who would be glad to have access to their views, especially on the more difficult passages. When a topic has required a special and extended discussion, I have placed that discussion in the body of the commentary, and not at the end as an excursus. Closely related as these epistles are to subjects relating to the constitution of the Christian Church and the character and work of the Christian ministry, I should have been glad of more room for special discussion, but the limits assigned me forbade an extended treatment.

The work has occupied for several years the time available to me from the duties of my position in this Seminary. Its imperfections probably no one will see more distinctly than I do. But such as it is, the fruit of no little toil and prayer, I now send it forth on its mission, praying that God will graciously accept it, and will make it helpful to students of his word in enabling them to gain a clearer view of the truths unfolded in these inspired epistles.

H. Harvey.

Hamilton Theological Seminary, Sept. 10, 1888.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus, are called Pastoral Epistles, because addressed to men placed in charge of churches, and occupied chiefly with instruction adapted to those who fill the pastoral office.

SECTION FIRST.—THE TIME OF WRITING.

Of this, two views have been advocated. One of these, assuming that Paul's martyrdom took place at the close of the Roman imprisonment recorded in the Acts, seeks a place for these epistles within the period described in that book; the other, on the supposition that the apostle was released from that imprisonment, and made missionary tours subsequent to those described in the Acts, places their date within this later period. The former theory is adopted by Lardner, De Wette, Baur, Winer, Wieseler, Davidson; the latter, by Paley, Neander, Huther, Van Oosterzee, Conybeare and Howson, Alford, Farrar, Schaff, and most later writers. The second of these views is to be preferred for the following reasons:

I. THERE IS NO SCRIPTURAL EVIDENCE OF PAUL'S MARTYRDOM AT THE CLOSE OF THE ROMAN IMPRISONMENT RECORDED IN THE ACTS.—The record there leaves Paul a prisoner, abruptly closing with the statement: "And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus with all confidence, no man forbidding him." (Acts 28 : 30, 31.) There is no intimation here, or elsewhere, that this imprisonment terminated in death; the supposition that it did is, therefore, a pure assumption, without Scripture warrant. On the other hand, it seems incredible that, if the apostle then suffered death, Luke should not have recorded so important a fact. It is true, indeed, that Paul, in his farewell discourse to the Ephesian elders, A. D. 58, says: "And now, behold, I *know* (οἶδα) that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more" (Acts 20 : 25); and in this he seems to have a presentiment of his approaching death, precluding the thought of his return to Ephesus and Asia. But this presentiment is plainly offset by the equally strong presentiment expressed several years later, A. D. 62 or 63, in the epistles written during his Roman imprisonment, where, confident of release and of future missionary work, he says: "I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better: nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful to you. And having this confidence, I *know* (οἶδα) that I shall abide and continue with you all for the furtherance and joy of your faith, that your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ for me by my coming to you again." (Phil. 1 : 23–26; 2 : 24.) So strong was this confidence that, in writing, about the same time, to Philemon at Colosse, he says: "Withal prepare me also a lodging; for I trust that through your prayers I shall be

given unto you." (Ver. 22.) Plainly, *I know*, when used by Paul as here, of his future personal life in this world, is not intended to indicate omniscient prescience, but to express a strong present presentiment, which may or may not accord with the actual future result. Hence these presentiments with him, as with all men, differed with different moods and circumstances; and they are truthfully thus recorded by the pen of inspiration. On the question, therefore, of Paul's release and subsequent return to Asia, they can have no decisive influence. But the later presentiment, uttered at Rome during his imprisonment, was surely more likely to be correct, because founded on the facts of his then present position.

II. Universal Patristic Tradition is in Favor of his Release.—The testimony is, indeed, not abundant, but it is all of one import. The earliest witness is Clemens Romanus, belonging to the first century, and probably the "Clement" mentioned (Phil. 4 : 3) as one of Paul's "fellow laborers." He writes of Paul: "After having taught righteousness to the whole world, and come to the extremity of the West and testified before rulers, he was thus freed from the world, and passed into the holy place, having shown himself a most eminent example of steadfastness." (*Ep.* 1 *ad Corinth.* ch. 5.) "The extremity of the West," as used in that period by a writer at Rome, would in all probability refer to Spain. Certainly it could not refer to Rome. It thus indicates, as indeed does the whole expression, a wider range of missionary work than that described in the Acts, and, consequently, a release and an extension westward of his apostolic labors. The next reference is in the Muratorian Canon, a fragment belonging to the last half of the second century, in which, referring to the Acts, the writer says: "Luke relates in detail, to the Most Excellent Theophilus, the events which transpired under his personal supervision, as also, in a separate place, the suffering of Peter; but (omits) the departure of Paul when he set forth from the city to Spain." Eusebius, early in the fourth century, wrote of Paul: "Having, therefore, made a successful defense, report has it that the apostle departed on the ministry of preaching, but having come again to the same city, he was perfected by martyrdom under him." (Nero.) ("Hist. Eccles.," II. 22.) Chrysostom, near the close of that century, affirms: Paul, "after having been in Rome, again departed for Spain." (*Ad.* 2 *Tim.* 4 : 20.) Jerome also, about the same time, referring to the first Roman imprisonment, said: "Paul was dismissed by Nero that he might preach the gospel also in the regions of the West." ("Vir. Illust.") These testimonies, with similar statements of Epiphanius, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Theodoret, though not numerous, are authorities of weight, and, so far as appears, they indicate the common tradition of the early churches. There was evidently no opposing view.

III. The Pastoral Epistles, all of Which, by Common Consent, Belong to the Same Period, Find no Place in the Historic Period Described in the Acts, but Presuppose a Later Period.—This may be shown from their historical allusions, from their diction and style, and from the character and circumstances of the churches as indicated in them.

1. *The historical allusions:* (*a*) At the time of writing the First Epistle to Timothy, Paul had left him at Ephesus, and had gone into Macedonia (1 : 3); but this cannot refer to Paul's first visit to Ephesus, since at that time there was no church at Ephesus, and the apostle, on leaving that city, went, not to Macedonia, but to Jerusalem. (Acts 18 : 19–21.) Nor can it refer to his second visit to Ephesus and three years residence there; for, on leaving Ephesus at that time, he did go to Macedonia. Yet, so far from

Timothy having then been left behind in Ephesus, the apostle had sent him before to Macedonia (Acts 19 : 22); and the salutation (2 Cor. 1 : 1), written soon after, shows that he was with Paul in Macedonia at the writing of that Epistle. And even if Timothy —as some suppose from 1 Cor. 16 : 11—returned to Ephesus before Paul left, then his presence with Paul so soon after in Macedonia is manifestly inconsistent with the whole tenor of the First Epistle to Timothy, as to Paul's intention in leaving him at Ephesus. (*b*) At the writing of First Timothy, moreover, Paul was expecting soon to return to Ephesus (1 Tim. 3 : 14); but, according to Acts 20, he had no such expectation at the leaving there recorded, but was on his way through Macedonia to Illyricum and Greece; and, as a matter of fact, he did not return to that city. (Acts 20 : 16) (*c*) In Second Timothy, which was evidently written at Rome not long before his martyrdom, the apostle says: "Erastus abode at Corinth; but Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick." "The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments." (4 : 13, 20.) These, and several similar allusions in that Epistle, plainly imply that Paul had very lately been in Corinth and Asia Minor; whereas, if the imprisonment mentioned in the Acts terminated in martyrdom, the Epistle must have been written five or six years after he had left those regions, with which long interval it is impossible to reconcile this language. Moreover, during Paul's last visit to Troas, as recorded (Acts 20 : 6), Timothy was with him, and afterward he repeatedly visited him at Rome. The cloak and book and parchments must have been long since recovered. Nor did he at that time leave Trophimus at Miletum sick; for this person was with him immediately after at Jerusalem, at the time of his arrest." (Acts 21 : 29.) Plainly, then, these events belong to a later period, and the writing of Second Timothy must be referred to a different and later imprisonment.

2. *The style and diction of these epistles indicate a later period.*—The Pauline Epistles may be separated into four distinct groups, consisting, *the first*, of First and Second Thessalonians, written on the second missionary journey, about A. D. 52, 53; *the second*, of Galatians, First and Second Corinthians, and Romans, written on the third missionary journey, about A. D. 55–58; *the third*, of Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians, Philippians, and Hebrews, written during the first Roman imprisonment, about A. D. 61–63; *the fourth*, of First and Second Timothy, and Titus, written, if our view is correct, about A. D. 64–68. Each of these groups of epistles is marked by its own special characteristics, plainly distinguishing it from the rest. These differences were occasioned partly by changes in Paul himself and partly by the difference in character and condition of those to whom they were addressed. Compare, for example, Galatians or Romans, of the second group, with Colossians or Ephesians, in the third group, and even the most superficial reader is conscious of a marked change in the language and style, and feels that the writer is dwelling in new realms of thought, and is dealing with new characters and circumstances. In like manner the Pastoral Epistles occupy a distinct place, alike in their range of thought and in their forms of expression, showing peculiarities which, though wholly Pauline, suggest a change in the writer's mental and spiritual standpoint, as well as in the characters and circumstances with which he is surrounded. The natural explanation of this is that this group of epistles belongs to a later period in the apostle's life, and sprang from the advanced experience then attained by him, and from the changed conditions then existing in the churches.

3. *The character and circumstances of the churches, as presented in these epistles, presuppose a later period.* (*a*) The church organization has gained a more fixed and

complete form. Instead of the many ministries and gifts seen earlier in the church, as in chapter 12, First Corinthians, two offices only are are here emphasized, pastors and deacons; and these appear, at least in the Ephesian Church, as regularly and fully established. Men are aspiring to places in them, and the required qualifications are distinctly specified. No new elements appear. The church is the same in all essential features as in the earlier period, but it has matured so that its form and order are more distinctly defined and fixed. (*b*) The schismatics and errorists, whom Paul at an earlier period had predicted as about to arise at Ephesus, in these epistles are seen as already present and drawing away the people. When addressing the Ephesian elders at Miletus, he said: "I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." (Acts 20 : 29, 30.) It is evident that, when these epistles were written, the heretics thus predicted had already appeared; and one chief object of the epistles, especially of First Timothy, is to guard Paul's assistants against these heretics, and instruct them how to deal with them. All this, with much more that might be adduced, clearly points to a period later than that embraced in the Acts, as the true epoch to which the composition of these epistles must be referred.

Accepting, then, with the majority of recent scholars, the conclusion that these epistles were written subsequent to the first Roman imprisonment, which terminated about A. D. 63, it remains to inquire the probable dates to be assigned them. Of necessity, these must be more or less conjectural. Second Timothy, it is evident, was written not long before the apostle's death, which, according to the most probable accounts, occurred A. D. 67 or 68; and as these epistles have so much in common, they probably belong to the same general period. The following outline of the apostle's course after the first imprisonment is, at least, not improbable. In accordance with the purpose expressed not long before his release (Phil. 1 : 26; 2 : 24; Philem. 22), after that event, A. D. 64, he returned to Macedonia and Asia Minor, visiting and strengthening the churches he had planted. If the statement of the Muratorian Canon and of Chrysostom, with other Fathers, is correct, he then journeyed, perhaps by way of Rome, to Spain, and there labored for a season in the work of evangelization, thus accomplishing the purpose expressed many years before. (Rom. 15 : 14.) About A. D. 65 or 66, he returns to the East, and labors again at Ephesus; and then, leaving for Macedonia, he writes from that province, A. D. 65 or 66, the First Epistle to Timothy, whom he had left in charge of the Ephesian Church. From Macedonia he seems to have sailed, with Titus, for Crete, spending a season preaching the gospel and organizing churches in that island. Leaving Titus there to complete the work of church organization, he probably returned, by way of Macedonia and Troas, to Ephesus; and, passing thence to Miletus, where he left Trophimus sick, he sailed from that port to Corinth, where Erastus remained. (2 Tim. 4 : 20.) From some point in this journey he sent, A. D. 66 or 67, the Epistle to Titus, with instructions as to the guidance of affairs in Crete, and direction to come to him at Nicopolis, in Epirus, where he intended to winter. (3 : 12.) Soon after, perhaps at Nicopolis, he is again arrested, and we next find him at Rome in prison. It was near the close of the bloody Nero's reign; and, instead of dwelling "in his own hired house," as in the former imprisonment, with freedom to preach the gospel, the apostle now, "as a malefactor," is thrust, chained, into a Roman dungeon. Such is the peril of his position that most of his friends forsake him; and when he stood arraigned before the Imperial Court on the first charge in his accusation, he was absolutely alone—all men

forsook him. In the vast throng which, in that august presence, listened to his noble defense of the gospel, no Christian ventured to appear. But the Lord stood with him; and on that charge he was acquitted. Another charge, however, remained; and he is remanded to the dungeon to await the new ordeal, which he confidently expects will result in condemnation and death. It was at this point—probably early in the fall, A. D. 67—Paul wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy, exhorting him to hasten his coming to Rome, and giving him his last charge as a minister of the Lord Jesus. At his second trial, according to the tradition, he was condemned to decapitation; and early in the summer, A. D. 68, the apostle, led forth from the city by the Ostian Way, was beheaded.

SECTION SECOND.—THE GENUINENESS.

The Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles was not called in question during the Patristic period, except, as was natural, by some of the Gnostics, who had dogmatic reasons for opposing them. They are quoted as genuine by the Apostolical Fathers, Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, and Polycarp. They are found in the Peschito Syriac Version, and in the Muratorian Canon, both belonging to the last half of the second century, the one representing the common view of the Oriental churches, the other that of the churches of the West. The latter, in its catalogue of Paul's Epistles, says: "*ad Titum una, et ad Timotheum duæ.*" (To Titus one, and to Timothy two.) They were received as genuine by the earlier Fathers, as Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Theophilus, and Tertullian; all of whom either quote from them, or refer to them, as the writings of Paul. Among the later Fathers the testimony is full and explicit. but need not be cited in detail, since Eusebius, of the fourth century, in his "Canon of Scriptures," ranks these epistles among the *Homolegomena*, or sacred writings whose genuineness and inspiration were unquestioned in the orthodox churches. ("Hist. Eccles.," III. 25.) The external proof is absolutely complete; and through all the Christian ages until a very recent period the Pauline origin of these epistles has been unhesitatingly accepted.

Of late, however, this has been violently assailed, especially in Germany. Schleiermacher led the way by questioning the genuineness of First Timothy. Eichhorn and De Wette denied the Pauline authorship of the three epistles, but placed the date of their composition in the first century and conceded them a place in the New Testament Canon. Baur and the Tübingen school held them as spurious, and assigned them to the second century. Most of those who impugn their genuineness, as Davidson, assign them a place, though secondary, in the New Testament, as the well-meant productions of good men, living near the apostolic age, who wrote under the name of Paul, from a desire to give apostolic authority to doctrines and instructions, in themselves true and useful, and in actual accord with those of the apostle. A full discussion of the question, entering into all its details, would occupy more space than the plan of this work admits. This will be found in other accessible works. See Davidson's "Introduction to the New Testament," where, in the later editions, the arguments against their genuineness are exhaustively presented. Also, Huther's "Introduction to the Pastoral Epistles," in Meyer's "Commentary"; Wiesinger's "Introduction" to these epistles in "Olshausen's Commentary"; and especially the Prolegomena to these epistles in Alford's "Commentary" (vol. 3, Am. ed.); in all of which their Pauline authorship is maintained. A valuable summary of the discussion will be found in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," in the article on "The Epistles to Timothy."

The chief objection urged against the genuineness of these epistles may be thus stated:

First: These epistles in their historic allusions find no place in Paul's life as recorded in the Acts; they cannot, therefore, have been written by him. This objection rests on the assumption that the apostle's death occurred at the close of the period covered by the Acts—an assumption which, in the above examination of the time of writing these epistles, we have found wholly unwarranted either by Scripture or history. If, as has been shown, Paul was released, and lived several years beyond that period, performing missionary tours and continuing his supervision of the churches, there was ample place in his life for these epistles, and the circumstances they present become every way natural and reasonable. Indeed, this single fact removes almost all the objections to the genuineness of these epistles, by adequately accounting for the historic allusions and the peculiarities they present.

Second: The language and style are not Pauline. The epistles do not exhibit that vigor and coherence of thought which are found in Paul's writings; and they contain a considerable number of words and phrases not used in the other epistles ascribed to him. To this it may be replied: Without doubt these epistles have peculiarities which markedly distinguish them from other Pauline writings, but this by no means disproves their genuineness. Such differences would necessarily exist from the circumstances under which they were written. They were composed several years after the others, when the apostle was older and more infirm, and his modes of thought and expression would naturally be modified. They were written, not to churches for public use, but to familiar friends; the elaboration and order which characterize most of his other writings could not here be expected, and would, indeed, be unnatural. The subjects here are, for the most part, different from those treated in the other epistles, rendering necessary the use of new words and phrases. Most of the other epistles were dictated to an amanuensis, whereas these were probably written by his own hand—a fact explaining many of their peculiarities. The difference in diction and style, however, has been greatly exaggerated. In point of fact, the number of peculiar words and phrases is not essentially greater than in some of the acknowledged epistles of Paul. Farrar states the results of research on this point thus: "There are no less than one hundred and eleven peculiar terms in the Epistle to the Romans; one hundred and eighty-six in the two Epistles to the Corinthians; fifty-seven and fifty-four respectively in the short Epistles to the Galatians and Philippians; six even in the few paragraphs addressed to Philemon. It is not, therefore, in the least degree surprising that there should be seventy-four in the First Epistle to Timothy; sixty-seven in the second, and thirteen in that to Titus." ("Life and Work of St. Paul," p. 613, Am. ed.) If, then, we consider the greatly altered circumstances under which the now aged and infirm apostle is writing these letters to his trusted assistants, and the widely different subjects he is treating, it becomes evident that a marked difference of diction and style is to be expected. Were such a difference wanting, this fact might go far to discredit their genuineness. All literature is full of examples of such differences in the same writers, writing at different periods of life, treating of different subjects, and addressing different persons. No man ordinarily writes a letter to a familiar friend with the elaborateness that he would use in a treatise or a public discourse. No author is always at his best. How wide is the gulf, in power and wealth of thought and splendor of diction, between "Paradise Lost" and "Paradise Regained"! The critic, reasoning on merely internal and subjective grounds, would find far more reasons for denying that the latter was written by Milton, than can be adduced for denying Paul's authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. In fact, such criticism is wholly false in principle, and, were it generally

applied, the genuineness of many productions of our best authors would be put in doubt, and no inconsiderable part of our literature be pronounced spurious. Besides, these peculiar words and phrases are the comparatively rare exceptions; the ordinary currents of thought and forms of expression are confessedly those of the acknowledged epistles of Paul; and it is far more difficult to account for this almost universal Pauline cast of thought and expression, which no imitator could possibly produce, than to account for these occasional divergencies from his earlier writings. The hypothesis of forgery in the case of these epistles devolves on its advocate the utterly hopeless task of explaining the all-pervading presence in them of the well-defined, distinctive thought and feeling and expressions of the Apostle Paul—a presence which does not reveal itself merely in occasional coincidences, but colors and permeates the whole substance and spirit of these productions.

Third: *The advanced church organization and the form of the heresies seen in these epistles belong to a period later than the age of Paul.* The church organization, it is said, is an incipient hierarchy, and the heretics are the Gnostics, both of which facts point to the post-apostolic age as the time of composition. Let us examine these objections:

1. *The alleged advanced ecclesiasticism.* (*a*) Hierarchical tendencies, it is said, appear in the rules relating to the clergy. But if so, it is singular that the terms "bishop" and "elder" are still used as perfectly synonymous, plainly designating the same officer (Titus 1 : 5, 7); that between the bishop and deacon no intermediate officer appears (1 Tim. 3 : 1–8); that no sacerdotal dignity or function is assigned to the clergy; and that there is no hint even of the presiding presbyter in the church college of presbyters, who, as "first among equals" (*primus inter pares*), appears so prominent in the second century: but the presbyters are evidently, as yet, all on the same level. The only advance seen in church organization is that the permanent officers, the pastors and deacons, are made more prominent, while those exercising special functions and miraculous gifts, who appear in the earlier epistles (1 Cor. 12), fall here into the background—an entirely natural fact, on the hypothesis of the composition of these late in the apostle's life. (*b*) It is farther objected, that the clergy are forbidden to remarry (1 Tim. 3 : 2), and that the term "widows" is used to designate an order of consecrated virgins in the church (1 Tim. 5 : 3–16), both of which point to a state of things which did not arise till the second century. But these objections are based upon a misinterpretation. A careful exegesis will show that the restriction, that the bishop be "the husband of one wife," does not forbid remarriage after the death of a former wife; and that the passage relating to widows not only contains no hint of a body of consecrated virgins, but the only body to which it does refer is one composed of widows maintained by the church, among the conditions of admission to which are that the applicant has been "the wife of one man" and has "brought up children." To interpret the word when, in the immediate connection, it is used of the "younger widows," as meaning virgins, is a gross violation of the law of context, one of the primary principles in exegesis, and is, to the last degree, forced and unnatural. In truth, the church, as seen in these epistles, retains all its original simplicity of organization, and differs from that seen in the earlier epistles only in that its permanent features have become more distinct, while the features that were merely temporary are disappearing.

2. *The alleged later form of the heresies referred to in these epistles.* The language used in describing these, it is said, points to the Gnosticism of the second century. Thus "the oppositions (ἀντιθέσεις) of science (γνώσεως) falsely so called" (1 Tim. 6 : 20); "forbidding

to marry and commanding to abstain from meats" (4 : 3); the "endless genealogies" (1 : 4), and the doctrine "that the resurrection is passed already" (2 Tim. 2 : 18), are all features of the Gnostic systems, as they appear in the second and in the following century. To this it may be replied: Without question, these false tendencies appear in the later Gnosticism; but it is equally certain that the germs of the Gnostic heresies existed in the apostolic age, especially in the churches of Asia Minor. This is plain from the Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians, in which, especially the former, these heretical tendencies appear even more distinctly than in the Pastoral Epistles. In this epistle, written as early as A.D. 61–63, the apostle exhorted the Colossians to beware of "philosophy and vain deceit," a "voluntary humility and worshiping of angels," "a show of will-worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body." (2 : 8, 18, 23.) But neither here nor in the Pastoral Epistles is there any evidence of a developed system of Gnosticism, as in the second century. These heresies are in their incipiency; and they affiliate even more nearly with Jewish than with Gnostic errors. The heretics aspire to be "teachers of the law" (1 Tim. 1 : 7); they give "heed to Jewish fables" (Titus 1 : 14); they are zealous in "strivings about the law" (Titus 3 : 9); all of which connects them, not with the developed forms of Gnosticism of the second century, but with the perverted Judaism which arose from contact with Oriental theosophy, and which is known to have existed in the first century. The ascetic features, also, of these heresies are more naturally referred to Jewish tendencies; and the doctrine that the resurrection is already passed, being fulfilled in regeneration, is as probably referable to the old Sadduceism.

Finally: The criticism which seeks to set aside the clearest external evidences of the genuineness of these epistles by purely subjective and internal considerations, not only utterly fails, as we have seen, to substantiate these considerations, but is, in its whole procedure, false in principle. It selects and emphasizes a few peculiarities (which certainly the circumstances reasonably explain), and then seeks by these to prove the spuriousness of these epistles; while it ignores the vital and decisive fact, that the pervading spirit, the ordinary type of thought, and the diction in general are essentially Pauline, and bear throughout the impress of the great apostle. Indeed, some of the most characteristic and magnificent Pauline passages, in which it is impossible to doubt his hand, occur in these very epistles. Were a rhetorician selecting from the whole New Testament passages to represent more clearly and forcibly the doctrine and spirit and style of Paul, it would be difficult to find any more suited to his purpose than these epistles afford. Take, for example, such as these: 1 Tim. 1 : 12–17; 3 : 14–16; 5 : 11–16. Titus 1 : 1–4; 2 : 11–14; 3 : 1–7. 2 Tim. 1 : 3–14; 2 : 8–14; 4 : 1–8. They are full of his most characteristic language and forms of thought, and breathe throughout his elevated Christian spirit.

SECTION THIRD.—THE LITERATURE.

The literature of the Pastoral Epistles is very extensive; but we shall here note only the more important and accessible works. Among the Reformers, Luther, Melanchthon, and Calvin wrote on them: the commentaries of the last named have great value even at this day, and will be found in the Edinburgh translation of his works. Of the later Continental commentaries, the following should be mentioned: that of Wiesinger, which forms a part of Olshausen's "Commentary"; that of Van Oosterzee, found in Lange's "Commentary," which is specially valuable, alike in its exegetical and in its doctrinal and practical notes; that of Huther, in Meyer's "Commentary," which is of high value, especially in its very satisfactory and exhaustive "Introduction"; that of Beck. "Exposition

of the two Epistles of Paul to Timothy" (*Erklärung der zwei Briefe Pauli an Timotheus*, 1879), an admirable and eminently evangelical exposition; that of Hofmann, "The Epistles of Paul to Titus and Timothy" (*Die Briefe Pauli an Titus und Timotheus*), 1874, which forms a volume in his "New Testament Commentary." "The First Epistle of Paul to Timothy" (*Der erste Briefe Pauli an Timotheus*), von H. Koelling, Berlin, 1882, who shows the Pauline authorship from internal grounds, answering especially the argument from linguistic considerations. The three first named are made accessible to English readers in excellent translations. Of other Continental authors, we may mention Mack, whose "Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles" (*Comm. ueber die Pastoral Briefe*), Tübingen, 1836, represents the Roman Catholic interpretation; Matthies' "Exposition of the Pastoral Epistles," etc. (*Erklarung der Pastoral Briefe, mit. bes. Beziehung auf Authentie und Ort und Zeit der Abfassung*), Griefswald, 1840; and De Wette, whose brief, but learned work (which includes Hebrews) has much value; the most important points in all these, however, will be found in the later works mentioned above.

Of English and American authors, if we pass by the older commentators, whose works have been, for the most part, superseded, we should specially mention the commentaries of Dean Alford, whose "Prolegomena" to these epistles, as well as his notes and critical apparatus, are of special value; of Bishop Ellicott, distinguished for thorough and scholarly exegesis; of Bishop Wordsworth, of less value in exegesis, but very full in patristic learning and citations; of Principal Fairbairn, whose work, entitled "The Pastoral Epistles; The Greek Text and Translation, Expository Notes, and Dissertations," is marked equally by rare good sense and by rich Biblical scholarship; and of Fausset, included in the "Commentary of Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown," which, though brief, is, in commenting on these epistles, remarkably judicious, and gives the results of very careful and scholarly investigation. Of the older commentaries, that of Henry, though lacking in critical value, excels here, as everywhere, in the wealth of its doctrinal, experimental, and practical suggestions; and that of Dr. Gill, though antiquated, is often rich in its recondite (especially rabbinic) learning, and in its profound doctrinal and spiritual insight.

Of general works, we may note as valuable for the understanding of these epistles: Neander's "Planting and Training of the Church" Schaff's "History of the Apostolic Church"; Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of St. Paul"; Paley's "Horæ Paulinæ." On the genuineness of these epistles, the work of Otto, entitled "The Historical relations of the Pastoral Epistles anew Examined," is remarkable for its full statement of the external evidences; and on the chronology, Wieseler's "Chronology of the Apostolic Times" (*Chronologie des Apost. Zeitalters*) is esteemed as most satisfactory by those who deny a second Roman imprisonment. For discussions on special topics in the epistles, it is hardly necessary to add, see Horne's "Introduction," edited by Tregelles; Smith's Dictionary of the Bible"; Alexander's, Kitto's "Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature"; and McClintock and Strong's "Cyclopedia."

INTRODUCTION TO THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

SECTION FIRST.—SKETCH OF TIMOTHY'S LIFE.

Timothy was probably a native of Lystra, in Lycaonia. His father was a Greek, but his mother a Jewess. (Acts 16 : 1–3.) He was early instructed in the Scriptures, and, under the pious influence of his mother, Eunice, and his grandmother, Lois, was doubtless trained in the knowledge and observances of the Hebrew religion. (2 Tim. 1 : 5; 3 : 14, 15.) His conversion seems to have occurred under Paul's ministry, during the apostle's first visit to Lystra, on the first missionary journey (A. D. 48–49); for Paul commonly refers to him as "his own son in the faith." (1 Tim. 1 : 2; 2 Tim. 2 : 2.) On the second missionary journey, A. D. 51–54, Timothy, being "well reported of by the brethren that were at Lystra and Iconium," was selected by the apostle as his assistant in the missionary work, and, after his circumcision (Acts 16 : 3), was formally set apart to the work by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. With this were connected the laying on of Paul's hands as an apostle, imparting the special, miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, and also certain prophetic utterances pointing out his divine call, as in the case of Barnabas and Saul (Acts 13 : 2), and perhaps predicting the future usefulness of the youthful minister. (1 Tim. 1 : 18, 4 : 14; 2 Tim. 1 : 6.) Thenceforward to the end of Paul's life, he remains the loved and trusted friend and companion of the apostle, associated with him in all the perils and labors and triumphs of his wonderful career; and the latest words of Paul, written just before his martyrdom, were sent to this true and faithful disciple.

Frequent notices of him are found in the Acts and the Pauline Epistles. From Lystra he accompanied Paul through Asia Minor to Macedonia, and assisted in planting the gospel at Philippi (Phil. 2 : 22) and probably in Thessalonica. At Berea he is left behind, with Silas, when Paul is driven away; and from this place, or from Athens, he was sent back to Thessalonica to guide and strengthen the imperfectly instructed and persecuted church there. (1 Thess. 3 : 2.) On leaving, he came, with Silas, to Paul at Corinth, where he labored in the establishment of the gospel, as also in the neighboring cities of Achaia. (Acts 18 : 5; 1 Thess. 3 : 6.) His name, with that of Silas, is associated with Paul's in the two epistles to the Thessalonians written at Corinth, and his service in that city is mentioned with high commendation. (1 Cor. 1 : 19.) On the apostle's third missionary journey he is again seen with him at Ephesus; and near the close of the three years spent there, he is sent to Macedonia and Achaia on special service to the churches in those regions. (Acts 19 : 21, 22; 1 Cor. 4 : 17; 16 : 11.) Returning, he is present with the apostle when, in Macedonia—probably in the autumn, A. D. 57—the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is written (2 Cor. 1 : 1); and in the following winter, A. D. 58, he is laboring with Paul at Corinth, when the Epistle to the Romans is written, as he there unites in the salutations sent to friends at Rome. (Rom. 16 : 21.)

On Paul's return eastward through Macedonia, Timothy was in the company that preceded him from Philippi and waited for him at Troas. (Acts 20 : 5.)

His subsequent course at this time is not indicated. It is not certain whether he accompanied the apostle to Jerusalem, and was with him during the two years imprisonment at Cæsarea and the voyage to Rome. But he was with him during the first Roman imprisonment,—A. D. 61–63,—as he is mentioned with glowing eulogy in some of the epistles written at that time (Col. 1 : 1; Philem. 1; Phil. 1 : 1); and in this last epistle Paul speaks of his intention to send him to Philippi for the comforting of the church there. (2 : 19–23.) If the Epistle to the Hebrews belongs to this period, it was probably at this time that Timothy suffered imprisonment at Rome (Heb. 13 : 23), and possibly there, in the presence of the Roman Imperial Court, witnessed the "good confession before many witnesses." (1 Tim. 6 : 12.) After the release of Paul from the first imprisonment at Rome, A. D. 63 or 64, his career, like that of the apostle, is not certainly known; but A. D. 65 or 66 he is with Paul at Ephesus, and on Paul's passing into Macedonia, Timothy is left behind to act in the apostle's place during his absence. (1 Tim. 1 : 3.) The separation seems to have been one deeply sorrowful to Timothy, who doubtless trembled in view of the responsibilities thus devolved on him. (2 Tim 1 : 4.) At a later period,—in the fall, A. D. 67,—the apostle, then a prisoner at Rome, writes the Second Epistle to Timothy, charging him to hasten his coming to that city and giving to him his farewell counsels. Beyond this, nothing is certainly known respecting this chief assistant of Paul. Whether he actually reached Rome before the apostle's martyrdom, and thus was present to cheer him in the closing scenes, is now unknown. Ecclesiastical tradition, which, however, is colored by hierarchical interest, makes him the first Bishop of Ephesus; but this is in direct conflict with the whole tenor of the Epistle, in which he everywhere appears, not as bishop, but as an assistant of the apostle; nor is there a shadow of support for the tradition in authentic history. He is reported as having suffered martyrdom under Domitian or Trajan.

The character of Timothy, as seen in Scripture, is one of rare beauty. He seems to have suffered, like the apostle, from ill health, probably occasioned by the hardships and privations of the missionary life. It is not improbable that these "often infirmities" tended to depress his spirits (1 Tim. 5 : 23), and led to a certain timidity, which gave occasion for the exhortations of Paul, summoning him to courage and fortitude in the perplexing and responsible posts he occupied. (1 Cor. 16 : 10; 1 Tim. 4 : 12; 2 Tim. 1 : 7.) But nowhere is there any indication of a real failure of faith. From his call at Lystra, A. D. 51, to the end of Paul's life, A. D. 68, he appears as the loved and trusted companion and helper of the apostle, never swerving from the truth of the gospel, never shrinking from the post of toil and danger and suffering, and never failing either in fidelity to the trusts committed to him, or in love and loyalty to Paul or to Paul's great Master.

SECTION SECOND.—THE TIME AND OCCASION OF WRITING.

It has already been shown that this Epistle falls within the period between the first and second imprisonment of Paul at Rome, and may probably be dated A. D. 65 or 66. The apostle had been laboring at Ephesus, but, on taking his journey to Macedonia, had left Timothy behind to act in his place in the Ephesian Church. There were two sources of grave anxiety. False teachers were arising in that church, apparently Jewish in their origin, "desiring to be teachers of the law," who taught that, through austerities and a certain secret knowledge, men attain a higher holiness than through faith in Christ and

works of practical piety. This was accompanied by a debased ethical standard, and a factious, disorganizing spirit. The other matter of anxiety related to the right organization and practical administration of the church by the admission to official station only of duly qualified men; by the proper dispensing of the charities of the church, especially in the case of widows; by the maintenance of quiet obedience to masters on the part of Christian slaves, and by the repression of the inordinate love of earthly gain, which prevailed, especially among the heretical class, in that wealthy and luxurious capital of Proconsular Asia. The position of Timothy—as representative of the apostle in that large and influential church, and as presiding over affairs among elders, some of whom must have been much older than himself—was one of great and delicate responsibility. It was specially important that his power to act by the authority of the apostle be fully authenticated, and he be given clear and explicit instructions for his guidance. Paul, therefore, after reaching Macedonia, sends this Epistle to him, an Epistle which, while admirably adapted for this immediate end, was also fitted to be a guide for church and ministerial action through all after ages.

SECTION THIRD.—THE CONTENTS.

No formal, systematic arrangement is found, as was to be expected in an epistle to a personal, familiar friend. The topics follow each other naturally, but apparently without premeditated order.

Chapter First.—Address and salutation (1, 2); his purpose in leaving Timothy at Ephesus (3, 4); the character of the false teachers of the law whom he is to withstand (5–7); the excellence and true end of law, which these pervert (8–11); Paul's thankfulness to God for his conversion and call to the ministry, notwithstanding his sin in persecuting the church (12–17); solemn charge to fidelity in his ministry (18–20).

Chapter Second.—The duty of public prayer for all men, especially for rulers, grounded on God's provision of mercy for all (1–7); the position and duties of the sexes in public worship (8–15).

Chapter Third.—The qualifications required in a bishop (1–7); those required in deacons (8–13); necessity of attending to these instructions, from the dignity of the church as the house of God, and its importance as the pillar and ground of the truth (14–16).

Chapter Fourth.—Prediction and description of a departure from the gospel (1–5); foolish and superstitious fables are to be avoided, and practical piety, rather than austerities, to be cultivated (6–10); solemn admonition to personal holiness and ministerial fidelity (11–16).

Chapter Fifth.—The spirit and manner in which admonition is to be given (1, 2); the duty of the church in regard to the care of widows (3–16); directions as to the compensation, discipline, and selection of elders (17, 18).

Chapter Sixth.—The duties of Christian slaves to their masters (1, 2); the evil character and influence of those who, opposing this instruction, teach a different doctrine (3–5); godliness with contentment great gain (6–10); Timothy, as a minister of God, must pursue high and holy objects (11–16); the rich must not trust in riches, but in God 17–19); solemn closing charge to Timothy to be true to the great trust committed to him, and an invocation of God's grace upon him (20, 21).

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

CHAPTER I.

PAUL, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the commandment of God our Saviour, and Lord Jesus Christ, *which is* our hope;
2 Unto Timothy, *my* own son in the faith: Grace, mercy, *and* peace, from God our Father, and Jesus Christ our Lord.

1 Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus according to the commandment of God our Saviour, and Christ Jesus our hope; unto Timothy, my true child in faith:
2 Grace, mercy, peace, from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord.

Ch. 1: 1-2. ADDRESS AND SALUTATION.—Paul, an apostle by divine commandment, addresses Timothy as his true child in the faith, and invokes on him grace, mercy, and peace from God our Father and Christ Jesus our Lord.

1. Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ. The word 'apostle' signifies: 1. *One sent*—used of messengers sent by the churches (2 Cor. 8 : 23); of Barnabas and Saul as, under the direction of the Holy Spirit, sent by the church at Antioch to the missionary work (Acts 13 : 2-5); and of Christ, as sent by God for the salvation of men. (Heb. 3 : 1.) 2. *One specially appointed to the apostolic office*, as the Twelve (Luke 16 : 12-16), and as Paul (Acts 22 : 14, 15; Gal. 1 : 1, 11-20.) The word is used here in the second of these senses, designating Paul as one called to the apostolic office, and invested with its authority. Here, however, as Paul's apostolic authority would not be questioned by Timothy, his companion and fellow laborer, it is not emphasized and proved, as in the Epistles to Corinth and Galatia, but is mentioned to indicate that the Epistle is not simply one of personal friendship, but has also an official character, and to certify to all readers alike the divine authority of the instructions herein given and the official position of Timothy as an authorized assistant and delegate of an apostle. **By** (or, *according to*) **the commandment.** Compare Titus 1 : 3. For this commandment, see Acts 19 : 15; 22 : 21; 26 : 17, 18. **Of God our Saviour.** This expression, which is frequent in the Old Testament, as Ps. 24 : 5; 51 : 14; Isa. 45 : 15, and is occasionally found elsewhere in the New Testament, as Luke 1 : 47; Jude 25, is used by Paul only in the Pastoral Epistles, and may indicate that they were written at a later period of life than the other Epistles. (1 Tim. 2 : 3; 4 : 10; Titus 1 : 3; 2 : 10; 3 : 4.) The conception, however, of salvation as originating with God the Father is one common to all his epistles (Col. 1 : 13; 1 Cor. 1 : 21.) **And Lord Jesus Christ which is our hope.** All our hope is in him in what he was and did on earth, what he is for us in heaven, and what he will be, and will do, for us hereafter. Compare Col. 1 : 27. "Not merely the author of hope, nor the object of it, but its very substance and foundation." (Ellicott.) "In him alone resides the whole substance of our salvation." (Calvin.)

2. Unto Timothy, my own (or, *genuine*, **son in the faith.** This refers to him: 1. As converted under Paul's ministry, probably during the apostle's first visit to Lystra. (Acts 14 : 6-20.) It thus indicates the special spiritual bond which binds him who is the means of conversion to the soul converted, so often referred to in Scripture (1 Cor. 4 : 14-17; Gal. 4 : 19); a relation which is represented as indissoluble even by death, and as recognized before God at the last day. (1 Thess. 2 : 19, 20.) It will then constitute the Christian's "crown of rejoicing"; his "glory and joy." 2. As faithful to the doctrines and work of Paul, a true representative of the apostle's life and spirit and teachings, and thus, as bearing his spiritual likeness, his "*genuine* son in the faith." **Grace, mercy, and peace.** This invocation of a threefold blessing, asking mercy as well as grace and peace, is found only in the Pastoral Epistles (2 Tim. 1 : 2; Titus 1 : 4; and in 2 John 3); a fact which, so far from disproving the Pauline authorship of these epistles, is a strong proof of their genuineness; for no imitator, in a place so conspicuous as the salutation, would have made so marked a deviation from the apostle's well-known form. It is far more natural to think that Paul, writing in his old age to assistants specially beloved, and for whom he felt the keenest solicitude, inserted the additional prayer for "mercy," as springing from his own enlarged experience

3 As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine,
4 Neither give heed to fables and endless genealogies,

3 As I exhorted thee to tarry at Ephesus, when I was going into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge certain men not to teach a different doctrine,
4 neither to give heed to fables and endless genealogies,

and his deep interest in them. 'Grace,' in the language of Paul, denotes God's free, unmerited favor. 'Mercy and peace' are the twofold manifestations of that favor; the former objectively, in justification, forgiveness, or remission of sin, and adoption into God's family; the latter subjectively, in regeneration and sanctification, the peace which flows from a consciousness of reconciliation and union with God. The whole expression is designed to invoke on Timothy all the fullness of blessing which comes through the gospel. **From God our Father and Jesus Christ our Lord.** The union of Christ with the Father, above in the commission of Paul as an apostle, and here in this invocation, of necessity involves his co-equal divinity; to place a creature, even the most exalted conceivable, thus side by side with the Infinite God, would be impious. God alone can stand to us in the relations and fulfill the offices here indicated. "Our Lord Jesus Christ is undoubtedly and undeniably God, because he is our hope and trust; now, if he were no more than a man, though never so excellent, to make him 'our hope' would be to make ourselves miserable; for 'cursed is the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm.' (Jer. 17 : 5.)" (Burkitt.)

3-4. Timothy Exhorted to Remain at Ephesus.—As Paul, when going to Macedonia, had urged Timothy to remain at Ephesus, that he might hold in check certain heresies and false tendencies, so now also he wills that he continue there for that purpose.

3. As I besought thee. Mark the tenderness and gentleness of Paul to his assistant; he did not command, but he besought him. It implies, perhaps, some reluctance on the part of Timothy to be separated from the apostle, and to assume a position responsible and difficult as that of the representative of the apostle in this great city. **When I went unto** (or, *was setting out for*) **Macedonia.** The expression does not absolutely decide that the apostle was at Ephesus when he thus besought Timothy; but, taken with the context, this is certainly the natural interpretation. **To abide still in Ephesus.** Timothy was then at Ephesus, and the apostle desires him to remain there. This journey of Paul to Macedonia, therefore, cannot be the one referred to in Acts 20 : 1; for at that time Timothy was not left at Ephesus, but had been sent before to Macedonia (Acts 19 : 22), where he evidently remained after the apostle's coming, since he is associated with Paul in the salutation of the Second Epistle to Corinth, which was soon after written from Macedonia. (2 Cor. 1 : 1.) **That thou mightest charge some.** He is to hold in check certain persons in regard to the following things: **That they teach no other doctrine**—that is, no different, opposing doctrine to that taught by Paul. It thus appears that it was among the teachers of the church these dangerous tendencies existed, and that the prophecy of the apostle, uttered eight years before, while taking leave of the elders of Ephesus, was already fulfilled when he said: "Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." (Acts 20 : 30.)

4. Nor give heed to fables and endless genealogies. These fables (*μύθοι*), without adequate reason, have been referred to the speculations of that Gnosticism which prevailed in the second century, whereas they seem plainly to have been Jewish. They are described in ch. 4 : 7, as "profane and old wives' fables," and in Titus 1 : 14 as "Jewish fables." Probably they were such as abound in the Rabbinic writings and which, as contemporary writers, Philo and Josephus, show, prevailed especially among the Oriental Jews. The 'endless genealogies' have been variously explained: (*a*) Of the emanations of æons, as taught in the later Gnosticism; thus Irenæus and Tertullian among the Fathers and many modern expositors; (*b*) of Jewish genealogies, such as are found in the Old Testament, but especially in the Rabbinical books, and to which the Oriental Jews gave an allegorical interpretation. The latter seems the more probable view, as in Titus 3 : 9 these genealogies are connected with "strivings about the law." From the standpoint of the Judaizing Christians, these genealogies, showing descent from Abraham

which minister questions, rather than godly edifying which is in faith: *so do.*
5 Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and *of* a good conscience, and *of* faith unfeigned:
6 From which some having swerved have turned aside unto vain jangling:

the which minister questionings, rather than a [1] dispensation of God which is in faith; *so do I now.* But
5 the end of the charge is love out of a pure heart and
6 a good conscience and faith unfeigned: from which things some having [2] swerved have turned aside unto

1 Or, *stewardship*.....2 Gr. *missed the mark.*

and a consequent claim to the promises made to him, were of supreme importance; but, as Herod had caused the public registers of genealogies formerly kept in the Temple to be destroyed, and there were now no means of verifying them, the difficulties respecting them must needs be 'endless,' and the discussion of them, while leading to no useful result, would minister only to strifes. Thus, in substance, Van Oosterzee, Wordsworth, Ellicott, and Alford. **The which** (*they being such as*) **minister questions** (*controversies*) **rather than godly edifying** (or, *the dispensation of God*) **which is in faith.** The reason for holding in check these false tendencies: they serve to foster the spirit of controversy, but fail to supply truth, that food of the soul which God dispenses in the gospel, and which is received only in faith. This alone has real worth; for only through divine truth are the souls of men regenerated and sanctified. (1 Peter 1:23; John 17:17.) *The dispensation of God* is the reading found in all the older manuscripts, and sustained by all the best editors; 'godly edifying' rests upon no critical authority.

5-7. THE FALSE TEACHERS OF THE LAW DESCRIBED.—The design or end of the message with which Timothy is charged is love, springing from a pure heart, a good conscience, and a genuine faith; but the false teachers, because failing of these qualities, have turned aside to empty, disputatious talk; and while desiring to be accounted teachers of the law, they understand neither their own speculations, nor the nature and end of the law of which they so strongly affirm.

5. But—in contrast with the end or tendency of the fables and genealogies referred to above. **The end of the commandment**—or, charge; the *aim*, *scope*, or *purpose* of the charge committed to Timothy; namely, the message and work of the Christian ministry in their practical bearing on character and life. **Is charity** (or, *love*). To awaken and foster love is the aim and tendency of the gospel message; whereas, these idle questions tend only to strife and hatred. (2 Tim. 2:23.) "Love is the fulfilling of the law." (Rom. 13:10.) It is the supreme, crowning grace of Christian character, the beauty and power and perpetuity of which are elsewhere so graphically depicted by our apostle. (1 Cor. 13.) It is, therefore, the grand result which all true preaching seeks. "The highest aim of all the labor of a Christian preacher should be a practical one; namely, to call forth true love." (Olshausen.) The love, thus developed, springs **out of** (1) **a pure heart;** a heart made pure in affection and single in purpose by faith. This purity of heart, which the Scriptures represent as essential to true religion (Matt. 5:8; 2 Tim. 2:22, Titus 1:15) is constantly ascribed to faith as its means. "Purifying their hearts by faith." (Acts 15:9.) (2) **A good conscience**—either a conscience pure in conscious rectitude of motive, as was Paul's even before his conversion (Acts 23:1; 26:9); or a conscience made free from the sense of guilt through justification in Christ's blood, and consequently acting in the light and under the inspirings of the Holy Spirit. (Rom. 9:1.) The latter is probably intended, as this is the constant conception of Paul, with whom a quickened, spiritualized conscience is always the effect of justification. (Rom. 7:6; Heb. 9:14; 10:22.) "A conscience unreconciled to God and man cannot love purely, because it cannot believe." (De Wette.) (3) **Faith unfeigned**—genuine faith, as opposed to that which is pretended, hypocritical. The heart and conscience, the whole moral and spiritual life, thus pervaded, purified, and uplifted by a genuine faith, becomes a fountain of love, from which a life of love issues. In such souls "the law of the Spirit of life" dominates, and, as the result, they are "spiritually minded," and "living in the Spirit" they are "led by the Spirit." (Rom. 8:6, 9, 15.)

6. From (or, *of*) **which** (qualities of heart and conscience and faith) **some having swerved**—literally, *having missed*, as of those who miss a mark. They pretend to aim at the

7 Desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.
8 But we know that the law *is* good, if a man use it lawfully:
9 Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for

7 vain talking; desiring to be teachers of the law, though they understand neither what they say, nor
8 whereof they confidently affirm. But we know that
9 the law is good, if a man use it lawfully, as knowing this, that law is not made for a righteous man, but

mark, but instead **have turned aside unto vain jangling**—empty, senseless, and disputatious talk. The 'vain janglings' here spoken of finds abundant illustration in the Rabbinical writings, which are full of absurd stories and speculations. Oberve: it was the failure in these moral qualities which led to their perversion of the gospel in preaching. The heart is the real source of error in religion. Sin blinds the spiritual perceptions and perverts the spiritual judgment. All false religious tendencies originate in a perverted heart. See Matt. 7 : 22, 23; Rom. 16 : 17, 18; 2 Thess. 2 : 11, 12; Titus 1 : 10; 2 Peter 2 : 3.

7. Desiring to be teachers of the law. They wished to be regarded as teachers of the law, to be "called Rabbi," **though** (from lack of these moral qualities) **understanding neither what they say**—that is, the real import of the assertions they make—**nor whereof they affirm.** Darkened in spiritual perception, they failed of a clear apprehension alike of the true nature and scope of their own speculations, and of the law itself, respecting which they so confidently affirmed. Plainly the teachers of the law here are not the Judaizers opposed in Romans, Galatians, and the earlier epistles of Paul. Here he is dealing, as Alford well says, "with men who corrupted the material enactments of the moral law, and founded on Judaism, not assertions of its obligation, but idle fables and allegories, letting in latitude of morals and unholiness of life. It is against this *abuse of the law* that his arguments are directed; no formal question arises of the *obligation* of the law; these men struck by their interpretation at the root of the divine law itself."

The general thought of the paragraph is summed up by Scott: "The design of the gospel is not answered by speculation and solving abstract questions, or giving heed to fables and endless disputations; but when sinners, through repentance toward God and faith in Christ Jesus, are brought to the habitual exercise of holy love, out of 'a pure heart, a good conscience, and faith unfeigned.' All doctrines, ordinances, and forms are just so far beneficial to us as they are useful in producing this effect in our hearts and lives; and all that faith is dead which does not thus influence men to love God and each other, in a practical manner."

8-11. The Divine Law, though thus Perverted, has its Right Use, According to the Gospel.—The law is morally excellent, if used (by the teacher) according to its true purpose, since, according to the gospel, the law has its proper application, not to the righteous, but to the wicked. "It was not made to fetter conscience by vain and troublesome austerities and ceremonies; it was to restrain and bind the wicked."

8. But we know—Paul's usual method of affirming a general truth which all must concede; it is probably used here concessively. **That the law is good**—not useful merely, but morally excellent; good in itself, and of good tendency. (Rom. 7 : 12-16.) **If a man use it lawfully**—that is, conformably to its true design. As if he had said: "We concede, as all must, that the law is in itself good; but, in teaching, it must be used in a manner conformably to its design." It was not intended as a means of the sanctification of saints, but as a means of conviction and warning for the wicked. It cannot, therefore, be that means of higher Christian experience and life which these false teachers would make it. The teacher, therefore, is to use it conformably to its true intention.

9. Knowing this, that the law is not made—is not enacted, appointed, does not exist—**for a righteous man,** a Christian, who has been constituted righteous by justification, and is righteous by virtue of regeneration and sanctification. "Since, according to the invariable doctrine of the apostle, all who are under the law are also under the curse of the law, so that by the works of the law no flesh can be justified (Gal. 3 : 10; Rom. 3 : 20), it follows that by the righteous a Christian man must be meant, one who has been justified by faith in Christ, and wholly renewed by the Holy Spirit. Of such a man, Paul says that the law was not made for him." (Van Oos-

the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers,
10 For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine;
11 According to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust.

for the lawless and unruly, for the ungodly and sinners, for the unholy and profane, for [1] murderers of fathers and [1] murderers of mothers, for manslayers,
10 for fornicators, for abusers of themselves with men, for men-stealers, for liars, for false swearers, and if there be any other thing contrary to the [2] sound [3] doc-
11 trine; according to the gospel of the glory of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust.

1 Or, *smiters*.....2 Gr. *healthful* .....3 Or, *teaching*.

terzee.) The question here is not whether the law, especially as interpreted by Christianity, does or does not contain for Christians a rule of life; on this the apostle here says nothing. But he affirms that the law is not the divinely appointed means of sanctification, or of a higher Christian life, and that consequently the false teachers, in attributing to the law such a function, are using it contrary to its design. In other words, he denies that the office of the law is to sanctify—a position he has clearly proved and illustrated in Rom, 7 : 4-25, where he shows that the effect of law is to awaken and intensify the sin-principle, and not to destroy it.

Those for whom the law is designed are now described under two general classes, following the order of the Decalogue: 1. *Sinners as arrayed against God:* **But for the lawless and disobedient**—those who refuse to be bound by any law, and who submit to no higher authority. (Titus 1 : 6, 10.) **For the ungodly and for sinners**—the impious and sinful; in nature and in act opposers of God. **For unholy and profane** *persons*—those who are impure in life and irreverent toward that which is sacred; men who in spirit and in character are the moral opposites of the divine purity and sanctity. 2. *Sinners as arrayed against society:* **For murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers.** It is probable, as Ellicott, Alford, and Huther suggest, that this should be rendered *father smiters* and *mother smiters*, since parricide and matricide were crimes very rare even among the heathen, and the original words are clearly used in this modified sense in the classics. This form of sin against the fifth commandment is forbidden. "He that smiteth his father or his mother shall be surely put to death." (Exod. 21 : 15.) **For manslayers**—*murderers.*

10. For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind—such as commit sins of uncleanness forbidden in the seventh commandment, as fornicators and Sodomites. (Rom. 1 : 27; 1 Cor. 6 : 9.) **For menstealers**—a common crime among the heathen; kidnapping men for slaves, for which the law prescribed the penalty of death. (Ex. 21 : 16.) **For liars, for perjured persons** (or, *false swearers*), denounced in the ninth commandment, and especially in Lev. 19 : 12. A false swearer designates both him who swears to that which is false and him who proves false to his oath. **And if there be any other thing**—intended to show that the law is against those who commit *any* form of sin, though not here specially mentioned. **Contrary to sound doctrine.** 'Sound' is, in the sense here intended, a word peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles. In its literal use it denotes *that which is healthy*, and also *that which is healthful.* Here, therefore, it characterizes teaching, not so much as respects its correctness, accuracy, although this is involved; but rather as respects its moral healthfulness, its tendency to lead to holiness of heart and life.

11. According to the glorious gospel (or, *gospel of the glory*) **of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust.** The gospel is the manifestation of the glory of the blessed God, since it is the highest revelation of his glorious nature and attributes. (2 Cor. 4 : 4, 6.) This verse qualifies the whole preceding statement, and affirms that, according to the gospel, the law is not enacted for the righteous, but for the lawless. The passage, thus interpreted, accords with Paul's doctrine of the law, as unfolded in Romans and Galatians, in which he insists that the office of the law, among sinful men, is to reveal sin, and thus awaken and convict the sinner. "By the law is the knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις) of sin." (Rom. 3 : 19, 20; Gal. 3 : 19, 24.) He denies that the law has power either to justify or sanctify the soul; this is accomplished only by faith in Christ. (Gal. 2 : 16; Rom. 7 : 9, 10.) But the believer, though neither justified nor sanctified by the

12 And I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry;
13 Who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious: but I obtained mercy, because I did *it* ignorantly in unbelief.

12 I thank him who [1] enabled me *even* Christ Jesus our Lord, for that he counted me faithful, appoint-
13 ing me to *his* service; though I was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious: howbeit I

1 Some ancient authorities read *enableth*.

law, is yet, by virtue of the new life-power, received by faith, rising to conformity to law—a conformity which constitutes the true goal of all the processes of salvation begun within him by "the Spirit of life." "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, *that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us*, who walk (in that we walk) not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." (Rom. 8:3, 4.) The divine law, therefore, though not intended for Christians, as a restraining and penal power, does yet, in its essential nature as an expression of God's holiness, constitute an ideal of righteousness, to which their character and life will be conformed by the life-working power of the gospel.

The thought of the passage, then, may be thus stated: The law, as allegorically interpreted by these false teachers, is not, as they affirm, a higher means of moral perfection for believers than the gospel; so far is this from being true, the law was not enacted for the Christian, the justified man, as a means of moral perfection, but for the sinner as a means of awakening, conviction, and judgment.

12-17. THANKSGIVING FOR HIS CALL TO THE MINISTRY, AND FOR THE MERCY SHOWN IN HIS CONVERSION.—As one intrusted with the gospel, the apostle renders thanks to Christ for his calling to the ministry, especially in view of his unworthiness as having been before a cruel, blaspheming persecutor. He explains that in his case mercy was possible, because, in thus persecuting, he had not sinned willfully by acting in conscious, deliberate opposition to his convictions, though he is nevertheless the chief of sinners; and that the design of the mercy thus bestowed was to exhibit in him, as the chief of sinners, the greatness of Christ's long suffering, and thus through all the ages to encourage the greatest of sinners to believe on Christ unto eternal life.

12. And I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who hath enabled me. 'Enabled,' *empowered me, filled me with power;* referring, not to official authority, nor to miraculous gifts, but to spiritual power. (Acts 9:22; Eph. 6:10; Phil. 4:13; 2 Tim. 2:1; 4:17.) "Endued with power from on high," he had been filled with the divine knowledge, wisdom, courage, patience, and faith, requisite for the great trust committed to him; a power which was promised, and has ever been given, by the ascended Lord to his chosen ministry. (John 14:15-17, 25; 16:7-15.) **For that** (*because*) **he counted me faithful, putting** (*as shown in that he put*) **me into the** (*a*) **ministry.** This was the subject, or occasion of his thanksgiving. 'He counted me faithful' may refer to Christ's designation of him to the apostolic work at the time of his conversion (Acts 26:12-18); if so, he gives thanks for the confidence thus expressed in his future fidelity. Or, as Paul did not actually enter on his distinctive work as an apostle till some years after his conversion (Acts 13:1-4), when his fidelity had already been tested, he may refer to this later epoch, when he was publicly recognized as an apostle, as the time when Christ, having thus proved him, counted him faithful, putting him into a ministry—that of apostle to the Gentiles.

13. Who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious—that is, notwithstanding I was before one who blasphemed the name of Jesus, persecuted his followers, and, in word and deed, subjected them to insult and outrage. The apostle confessed before Festus: "Many of the saints did I shut up in prison, having received authority from the chief priests; and when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them. And I punished them oft in every synagogue, and compelled them to blaspheme; and being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto strange cities." (Acts 26:11, 12.) Such had been the greatness of his sin; but, notwithstanding this, Christ had not only forgiven him, but had also appointed him to an exalted ministry in that very church he once thus outraged and destroyed. **But I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in un-**

14 And the grace of our Lord was exceeding abundant with faith and love which is in Christ Jesus.
15 This *is* a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief.

obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbe-
14 lief; and the grace of our Lord abounded exceedingly
15 with faith and love which is in Christ. Faithful is the saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom

belief. The reason mercy was possible in his case was that he was not self-hardened by conscious and persistent resistance of the Holy Spirit. He had not sinned willfully, after receiving a knowledge of the truth; but rather as blinded by ignorance in the darkness of unbelief. (Acts 3 : 17.) Consequently, though he was deeply guilty for that unbelief, repentance was still possible, and, subjectively, he stood within the pale of mercy. There is here no thought of extenuating his guilt, but only an explanation of the fact that, being so great a sinner, he could still find mercy. He nad not committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, as those who have persistently resisted the clear convictions of their own consciences and the illumination and urgencies of the Spirit of God; and therefore, great as his guilt was, his moral nature had not reached that point of utter self-hardening, where repentance and faith are forever impossible, and the sin becomes that which "shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." (Matt. 12 : 31, 32.)

14. And the grace of our Lord was exceeding abundant (or, *superabounded*)—it revealed itself in my case, not in an ordinary, but in an extraordinary act of mercy. In its fullness, it far surpassed the grace shown to ordinary sinners. "The metaphor is derived from a stream. I by my sins obstructed the course of God's grace, but the stream of his mercy brimmed over and overflowed the mounds and dams of my sinfulness, by the surpassing exuberance, copiousness, and power of its spiritual inundation." (Wordsworth.) **With faith and love**—the subjective concomitants and results of the flood of grace. The apostle comprehends in faith and love all the actuating principles or motive forces in Christian character, and here, as is his wont, traces them directly to their source, the grace of the Lord. (1 Cor. 15 : 10; Eph. 3 : 8.) **Which is in Christ Jesus**—that is, the love Paul exercises toward others originated in, and was kept alive through his union with Christ Jesus. Love to men has its source, and finds its power only in a believing apprehension of Christ's love to us. All genuine fruitage in the branches comes from Christ, the vine. (John 15 : 1-5.)

15. This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation—an expression used to give solemnity and emphasis to the following statement, as worthy of the utmost attention and confidence. Paul uses it only in the Pastoral Epistles. (1 Tim. 3 : 1; 4 : 9; 2 Tim. 2 : 11; Titus 3 : 8.) It may be classed, therefore, with a few other peculiar phrases, among the indications that these epistles were written at a later period than the others, and in near connection with each other. It is an expression eminently befitting Paul, the aged, attesting his sense, from the experience of advancing years, of the certainty and worth of the great facts of the gospel. **That Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.** This is the word which is worthy of all acceptation. The emphasis is on 'sinners,' indicating this, as the source of his joy and hope, as well as the joy and hope of all men, that Christ "came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance," to seek and to "save that which was lost." 'Came into the world': note the allusion to Christ's pre-existence before "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." (John 1 : 1-14.) **Of whom I am chief.** This was true of Paul. 1 As the testimony of his own consciousness. The profound insight given him into his own heart must have produced in him, as such insight has always produced in the Christian, the feeling that surely no other could have sinned so grievously as himself. The publican, when standing before God, convicted of sin, cried, "God be merciful to me, *the* sinner!" See Luke 18 : 13, Revised Version, margin. He seems to have been so utterly absorbed in the consciousness of his own sin, that he thought of himself as the only sinner, his own sin filling the whole horizon of his mind. In like manner Paul, with clear insight into his own heart and with quickened sense of the holiness of God, truly feels that he is chief of sinners, surpassing all others in the turpitude and greatness of his guilt. And 2. As a matter of fact, none had surpassed, perhaps none had equaled him, in

16 Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might shew forth all longsuffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting.
17 Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, *be* honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

16 I am the chief: howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me as chief might Jesus Christ show forth all his longsuffering, for an ensample of them who should thereafter believe on him unto eternal
17 life. Now unto the King [1] eternal, incorruptible, invisible, the only God, *be* honour and glory, [2] for ever and ever. Amen.

1 Gr. *of the ages*.....2 Gr. *unto the ages of the ages.*

the boldness and fury with which he had persecuted the church, and defiantly opposed the Lord Jesus. This last is probably the prominent thought here.

16. Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy. He now unfolds the special purpose of Christ, as it respects men, in thus showing mercy to him, the greatest of all sinners; it was to show, in this case, to all future ages the boundlessness of mercy in the gospel, and thus encourage even the worst sinners to seek it in Christ. **That in me first**—that is, as the first or chief of sinners, the one who surpassed all others in sin. **Jesus Christ might show forth all longsuffering**—the full, boundless extent of it; that, in being shown to me, the chief sinner, the long suffering of Christ might find the highest possible exemplification. **For a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting.** The purpose was to set before sinners in all after ages an example of the marvelous extent of Christ's patience and mercy, in the long suffering and grace shown to him, to the end that even the worst of sinners may be emboldened to believe in Christ 'to everlasting life.' If the Lord saved Paul, then no sinner need despair. "No man, with Paul's example before him, can reasonably question the love and power of Christ to save him, whatever his sins have been, if be really desire and endeavor to trust him as the Incarnate Son of God, who once died on the cross and now reigns on the throne of glory, in order to save all who come unto God through him." (Scott.) A different view is urged by Hofmann, and is perhaps worthy of consideration. It is as follows: *To me first*—that is, *first*, not by eminence, but in time. Paul was first in a long line of blaspheming, persecuting sinners, to whom Christ would show his long suffering and mercy. Under the Old Dispensation, judgment had *speedily* fallen on opposers, but now, under Christ, mercy would wait and would bring even the greatest sinners to repentance. Paul was thus a pattern or ensample, not *to*, but, as the text says, "*of* those who should hereafter believe on him." Christ's mercy to him, therefore, was only the beginning of a long series of like exhibitions of his mercy.

17. Now unto the King eternal (or, *of the ages*, Revised Version, margin), designating God as the infinite Former and Controller of the periods or cycles through which the universe has passed or will hereafter pass. It is equivalent, therefore, to King of Eternity. "He is presented to our view as supreme Lord and Director of the successive cycles or stages of development through which this world, or the creation at large, was destined to pass—the Sovereign Epoch-maker, who arranges everything pertaining to them beforehand, according to the counsel of his own will, and controls whatever takes place, so as to subordinate it to his design." (Fairbairn on Ps. 145 : 13.) **Immortal** (or, *incorruptible*)—imperishable, undecaying, as 6 : 16, "who only hath immortality." **Invisible**—"dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen nor can see." (6 : 16.) **The only wise God**—the only true, real God. (Deut. 4 : 35 ; Isa. 44 : 6.) 'Wise' is not in the best manuscripts. **Be honour and glory for ever and ever** (or, *unto the ages of the ages*). **Amen**—that is, *unto eternity*, the infinite future being considered as a series of periods, or cycles, stretching endlessly onward. This sublime doxology, which has no exact parallel in Scripture, bursts forth from the grateful, adoring heart of the apostle, as he surveys the infinite depths and fullness of God's mercy, experienced by him as the chief of sinners, and promised in Jesus Christ to the guiltiest and vilest sinners on earth. The most glorious view of God is that gained by an humbled, penitent soul, looking up to him as he appears in Christ crucified. (Rom. 16 : 25-27 ; 1 Tim. 6 : 16.)

18-20. SOLEMN CHARGE TO FIDELITY IN THE MINISTRY.—The apostle enjoins Timothy that, incited by the prophecies formerly uttered respecting him, he should accomplish

18 This charge I commit unto thee, son Timothy, according to the prophecies which went before on thee, that thou by them mightest war a good warfare;
19 Holding faith, and a good conscience; which some having put away, concerning faith have made shipwreck:

18 This charge I commit unto thee, my child Timothy, according to the prophecies which [1] led the way to thee, that by them thou mayest war the good
19 warfare; holding faith and a good conscience; which some having thrust from them made shipwreck

1 Or, *went before on thee.*

the good warfare by holding faith and a good conscience; since some, having thrust away a good conscience, had made shipwreck in respect of the faith, among whom he instances Hymeneus and Alexander, whom he had delivered to Satan, that, by their chastisement, they might learn not to blaspheme.

18. This charge I commit unto thee, son Timothy. The purport of the charge is expressed in the last clause of the verse, in regard to the good warfare. The form of address marks the solemnity and importance of the duty enjoined. **According to the prophecies which went before on thee**—former prophecies, uttered probably in connection with his ordination, which both indicated his divine call as an evangelist and predicted his future eminence in that office. Thus ch. 4: 14: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee through prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery"; also 2 Tim. 1: 6: "Wherefore I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands"; where it would appear that Paul, as an apostle, had united with the elders of Lystra in the ordination of Timothy (Acts 16: 1-3), and that by the laying on of the apostle's hands a certain spiritual gift had been supernaturally imparted. The prophetic utterances which preceded this may have been made either through Paul himself or through Silas, who was a prophet (Acts 15: 32), or through prophets in that church; and as they were distinct divine assurances of his heavenly call, and of his success in the work assigned him, it was fitting that he should remember these divine predictions, and find in them strength to endure hardness in it. The true minister, in the midst of discouragements, afflictions, and persecutions, finds nothing more inspiring than a vivid remembrance of his divine call to the position and the work in which he is engaged. It gives faith, patience, perseverance, assurance—the qualities by which he triumphs over adversity, and often snatches victory from seeming defeat. Such a prophetic utterance conveyed the divine call to Barnabas and Saul: "The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." (Acts 13: 2.) **That thou by** (or, *in*) **them mightest war a** (*the*) **good warfare.** This is the purport of the charge that, incited by, clad in the armor of, these prophecies, he should war the good warfare. Encouraged by the memory of these divine, prophetic words, he should persevere, amid all obstacles and sufferings, in the great work of the ministry, which had thus been distinctly given him by God. 'The good warfare' denotes not a single battle, but the well-known, perpetual conflict, appointed for the Christian and especially for the Christian minister, the whole war, extending to its final issue in complete victory. (2 Tim. 4: 7.)

19. Holding faith and a good conscience—that is, by holding faith and a good conscience; indicating the means by which 'the good warfare' is to be accomplished. A pure faith and a clear conscience are essential to the maintenance of fidelity in the Christian and ministerial life. **Which** (good conscience) **some having put away** (or, *thrust from them*). There is something in the word implying the violence of the act required, and the importunity of conscience, reluctant to be so extruded. (Alford.) **Concerning faith have made shipwreck.** The refusal to maintain a good conscience resulted in the loss of the faith, or the true doctrine of the gospel. The yielding to sin dulled the perception of truth, and opened the way for the influx of error. The wreck of faith in the soul is thus directly traced to sin in the life, by which the spiritual perceptions are first made obtuse, and then perverted. The reciprocal relation of conscience and faith is such that the perversion of the one leads, by a natural law, to the perversion of the other. A clear conscience is essential to a pure faith; hence, Christ said: "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." (John 7: 17.) Heresy has its source, ordinarily, not in the head, but in the heart; an evil conscience, which resists, rather than obeys, the will and word of God.

20 Of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme.

20 concerning the faith: of whom is Hymenæus and Alexander; whom I delivered unto Satan, that they might be taught not to blaspheme.

20. Of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander. Of these names, the former appears in 2 Tim. 2 : 17, where it probably indicates the person here referred to; the latter is found in 2 Tim. 4 : 14, with a descriptive addition, "the coppersmith," and also in Acts 19 : 33, as the name of a prominent Jew at Ephesus. We have no means of knowing which, if either, of these is here designated, for Alexander was a name so common that quite possibly it might designate three different persons among the Christians at Ephesus. **Whom I have delivered unto Satan**—probably, by an act of excommunication, by which they were placed outside of the visible kingdom of God and, so to speak, replaced within the realm of Satan. In the language of Scripture, the devil is called "the god of this world," "the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience," and the powers of evil are described as "the rulers of the darkness of this world"; and the soul at conversion is said to be "delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of his (God's) dear Son." (Eph. 2 : 2; 6 : 12; Col. 1 : 13.) This general representation of Scripture, that outside of the visible kingdom of God on earth is the kingdom of Satan, is here probably the underlying conception. **That they may learn** (Revised Version, *might be taught*) **not to blaspheme.** The word here rendered 'learn,' 'taught,' signifies commonly to be *instructed by discipline or chastisement.* (Luke 23 : 16; 1 Cor. 11 : 32; 2 Cor. 6 : 9.) Discipline, as inflicted in the apostolic churches, was sometimes accompanied by bodily evils and sufferings, at least when administered by apostles; and the act of the church in administering it was thus, by miraculous intervention, attested as having the sanction of God. That such discipline is referred to here may be inferred from the following considerations: 1. Satan is represented as the medium of physical evils Thus the calamity and bodily sufferings of Job, the "spirit of infirmity" of the woman in the gospel, and the mental and bodily evils of demoniacal possession, are all directly attributed to Satan as the medium; and Paul calls "the thorn in the flesh" "a messenger of Satan." (Job 2 : 6; Luke 13 : 16; 2 Cor. 12 : 7.) 2. Paul, in the case of the incestuous man, directed the Corinthian Church: "In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." (1 Cor. 5 : 4, 5.) Intimations of such bodily chastisments for sin are found in 1 Cor. 11 : 30–32, where, in speaking of their misconduct at the Lord's Supper, the apostle says to the Corinthians: "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep." It seems probable, therefore, that, accompanying this act of excommunication, there was some form of bodily suffering which was intended to awaken and reclaim the offender. Thus most expositors. Ellicott says: "We conclude then, with Waterland, that delivery over to Satan was a form of Christian excommunication, declaring the person reduced to the state of a heathen, accompanied with the authoritative infliction of bodily disease or death." Alford: "The delivering to Satan, as in 1 Cor. 5 : 5, seems to have been an apostolic act, for the purpose of active punishment, in order to correction." See also Wordsworth on 1 Cor. 5 : 5. Barnes: "This was an extraordinary and miraculous power. It was designed for the government of the church in its infancy, when everything was fitted to show the direct agency of God; and it ceased, doubtless, with the apostles. The church now has no such power."

Ch. 2 : In unfolding the charge committed to Timothy, the apostle gives in this chapter special directions in regard to worship in the public assembly.

1-7. THE DUTY OF PUBLIC PRAYER FOR ALL MEN, ESPECIALLY FOR RULERS.—As reasons for this duty he states: 1. The necessity of good government, in order to a quiet and peaceful life; and 2. The excellence and acceptableness of such prayer in the sight of God, inasmuch as he wills the salvation of all men. In proof that God has such good-will toward all, and that public prayer, therefore, should be offered for all, he shows (*a*) that

CHAPTER II.

I EXHORT therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, *and* giving of thanks, be made for all men;
2 For kings, and *for* all that are in authority: that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.

1 I exhort therefore, first of all, [1] that supplications, prayers, intercessions, thanksgivings, be made for
2 all men; for kings and all that are in high place; that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all

1 Gr. *to make supplications, etc.*

there is one God for all men; (*b*) that there is one Mediator between God and all men; (*c*) that the Mediator gave himself a ransom for all; and (*d*) that the testimony to this universal provision and offer of salvation in the gospel is the divine message appointed for the Christian ages, for which testimony Paul had been specially appointed an apostle and teacher of the Gentiles.

1. I exhort, therefore, first of all. He had charged Timothy (1:18) *to war the good warfare* in the Christian ministry; and now, passing from that general charge, he gives this specific one in regard to the conduct of worship in the Christian assembly. 'First of all,' therefore, does not mean first in importance, nor first in the order of public worship, but first in the series of directions he is about to give Timothy. **That supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks.** The four terms here used, while doubtless cumulative, serving to emphasize the duty enjoined, also express distinct phases of prayer, and are in some respects distinct in their use. Though each is sometimes used as a general term for prayer, they seem here to describe the several divisions into which public prayer naturally falls. 'Supplications,' derived from a word signifying need, denotes prayer as arising from the feeling of need, and thus embraces all petitions relating to the wants of the suppliants. 'Prayers,' where the act is not petition, but worship, the prompting thought being, not the needs of the suppliant, but the being, attributes, and acts of God, the object of worship; and hence, the word includes adoration, praise, and worship, as inspired by the character and acts of God. 'Intercessions,' prayers offered, not for ourselves, but for others, in which the suppliants, looking out from themselves upon the needs of all classes and conditions of men, make petitions for others in special need, or for the community, the nation and the world. (Rom. 8:34; 11:2; Heb. 7:25.) 'Giving of thanks,' wherein the worshipers, devoutly recognizing the mercies, temporal and spiritual, received from God by themselves and by all men, offer thanksgiving for the same in the Christian assembly, thus acknowledging and adoring God as, through Christ, the Author and Dispenser of all good. These several sides of public devotion, petition, adoration, intercession, thanksgiving, are here mentioned, not as directing the order in which they should be presented (this, doubtless, should be varied), but as exhibiting the comprehensiveness and the outreaching, universal spiritual sympathy required in public worship. (Eph. 6:8; Phil. 4:6.) "Christians," as a priestly race, in behalf, and for the welfare, of all men, shall offer supplication for the common need (δεήσεις), shall adore and invoke God as the common Father of all (προσευχάς), shall intercede and give thanks (ἐντεύξεις and εὐχαριστίας) for special needs and blessings as they appear among the different classes and circumstances of men, in adversity and prosperity." (Beck.) **Be made for all men**—all men without exception, but here contemplated as existing in different classes and conditions.

2. For kings and for all that are in authority—as a distinct and conspicuous class, selected for special emphasis in public prayer. The end or purpose, as also the importance, of prayer for rulers is now indicated. **That we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty** (or, *gravity*). That is, that God may so influence the minds of those in authority as to lead to a wise and just government, thus enabling Christians to live in peace, free from turmoil and oppression, and to pursue a life right in the sight of God and honorable in the sight of men. 'Quiet and peaceable'—words essentially synonymous used to emphasize the thought. Honesty, or, *gravity;* the word, though implying honesty, integrity, specially designated that which is decorous, becoming; a conduct which is honorable, respected, and which before men befits the Christian profession. God-

3 For this *is* good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour;
4 Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.

3 godliness and gravity. This is good and acceptable
4 in the sight of God our Saviour; who would have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the

liness and gravity thus present the two sides of life, the former the life toward God, the latter the life toward men. Such prayer recognizes the fact that the hearts of rulers are in the hands of God, to guide, influence, and overrule for the best good of his people; and the offering of it in public worship is here strictly enjoined. It is evident, if prayer for rulers was obligatory under the cruel reign of a Nero, the obligation to it must remain to all ages, wholly irrespective of the form of the government and of the character of those in authority; and doubtless, prayer for the government, rather than denunciation of it, is the more effective, as well as the more befitting, service in the Christian assembly. According to Josephus, it was the refusal of the Jews to offer sacrifice in the temple for their heathen rulers, which proved the immediate occasion of the terrific conflict that resulted under Titus in the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Jewish state. ("Bell. Jud." II. 17, 2.) The apostolic churches, on the other hand, always made prayer for rulers prominent in the worship of the Christian assembly; and Justin Martyr, in his "Apology," when vindicating Christians from the charge of fomenting sedition, appeals to this fact and cites this passage in the writings of Paul. ("Apol." 31.)

3, 4. The apostle now suggests motives which should lead to prayer for all men, as enjoined, ver. 1. **For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour.** Such prayer is in God's sight both morally excellent and well pleasing. God is here called "our Saviour" to intimate at once the claim he has on our regard for what is acceptable to him, and the motive we have to pray for the salvation of others in the fact that he saved us. **Who will have all men to be saved**—or, *since he wills that all men should be saved.* Here (1) is the proof that prayer for all is acceptable with God; it is in harmony with his own benevolent will. His infinite benevolence embraces all men, and would find satisfaction in their salvation, Here also (2) is a motive to prayer for all men. If God benevolently wills that all men should be saved, we ought to be in sympathy with him, and pray for all. "Imitate God; if he wills that all men should be saved, do thou also will it; but if thou willest it, pray for it." (Chrysostom.) Note: It is not said that God has decreed to save all men; this would contradict other Scriptures, and would be contrary to fact, since some are plainly not saved. (Matt. 25:41-46; John 5:28, 29; 2 Thess. 1:6-9.) But he wills that all men should be saved. It is his will of benevolence; that will, or disposition of his infinite heart of sympathy, which finds perpetual expression, when he "maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust"; and which found its noblest expression, when he made his Son "the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world" (Matt. 5:45; 1 John 2:2), and thus by an infinite sacrifice provided a salvation adequate for, and freely offered to, all men. This benevolent desire of God for the salvation of all men is often seen in Scripture. "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live." (Ezek. 33:11.) "The Lord is long-suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." See 2 Peter 3:9; compare Hosea 11:8; Matt. 23:37. He desires their salvation, however, only in accordance with the principles of his righteous government, and therefore through faith in the redemption he has provided in Christ. "Paul teaches not only here, but in other places (compare Rom. 8:32; 11:32; Titus 2:11), that the desire of God to bless all sinners is unlimited, but it can only be in the ordained way of faith." (Van Oosterzee.) **And to come unto the knowledge of the truth.** The means by which salvation must be appropriated is by coming to the knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις, full apprehension, realization, conviction) of the truth; not all truth, but *the* truth, "the truth as it is in Jesus." God wills, therefore, that men be saved by coming to a knowledge of the truth. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that *whosoever believeth in him* should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John 3:16.)

5 For *there is* one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;
6 Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.

5 truth. For there is one God, one mediator also between God and men, *himself* man, Christ Jesus,
6 who gave himself a ransom for all; the testimony

5. For—the ground of God's benevolent will for the salvation of all men, and of the consequent duty of public prayer for all. **There is one God**—as there is but one God, the Creator, Preserver, and Benefactor of all men, it is evident that he is God, not of a part of men only, but of all men, and in his benevolent will he must desire the salvation of all men. The same argument is used in regard to the universal offer of salvation. See Rom. 3 : 29, 30; compare 1 Cor. 8 : 4–6; Eph. 4 : 6. **And one mediator between God and men**—the fact that one Mediator stands between God and all mankind also shows the impartial regard of God for all men, and the consequent duty of prayer for all. A mediator (*μεσίτης*) is one who stands between parties who are at variance, in order to reconcile them, or who are in nature and dignity so widely separated that they can communicate only through an intermediate person. The word is used of Moses, because he stood between God and Israel, communicating God's will to them, and interceding with God for them. (Exod. 20 : 19-22; Deut. 5 : 22-31; Gal. 3 : 19, 20.) It is elsewhere used of Christ. (Heb. 8 : 6; 9 : 15; 12 : 24.) The idea of mediation, which was central in the Old Testament, pervades the New. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." "No man cometh unto the Father, but by me." (John 1 : 18; 14 : 6.) **The man Christ Jesus.** The article is not in the original. It is not *the* man, nor *a* man, but MAN, humanity exalted to true manhood by its union with God in the person of Christ Jesus. The expression emphasizes the nature in which Christ acts as Mediator: it is in Humanity, the nature common to all men, and therefore all who bear that nature have a part in his mediation. (Heb. 2 : 6-18.) For as the Son of God took on him the nature of man, in order therein to act as Mediator, it follows that he is the Mediator for all who bear that nature. No son of man, however lost and degraded, falls without the scope of Christ's mediation, but has through it the possibility of salvation in the SON OF MAN, the one Mediator between God and Humanity. Herein we see the worth and dignity of man, since it is in Humanity Christ is performing his mediatorial work, and, by thus exalting our nature, has set before every human being the glorious possibilities of salvation and eternal life.

6. Who gave himself a ransom for all. The ransom he paid was paid for all, and if he died for all, his church ought to pray for all. 'Gave himself' points out, not only the voluntariness of his offering, as John 10 : 17, 18, but also the completeness of it. He gave, not his life only, but himself, in his whole personality and work, including his humiliation, suffering, and death, as described in Phil. 2 : 5–8. "That the main fact alluded to here is the *death* of Christ, we know; but it is not brought into prominence, being included in and superseded by the far greater and more comprehensive fact, that he gave *himself*, in all that he undertook for our redemption." (Alford.) 'A ransom (*ἀντίλυτρον*) for all.' The simple form (*λύτρον*) denotes, according to Cremer: 1. "The price paid for the liberation of those in bondage." 2. "The means of expiation with reference to this result." The compound word, used only here in the New Testament, brings forward more distinctly the idea of substitution. Thus Wordsworth: "What does he mean by ransom? Mankind was guilty, and liable to the punishment of death, and he gave himself in their stead (*ἀντί*)." Ellicott: "In this important word the idea of a substitution of Christ in our stead *cannot* be ignored." Fausset: "Not merely *ransom*, but a *substituted* or *equivalent ransom*, the Greek preposition (*ἀντί*) implying reciprocity and vicarious substitution." Thus most interpreters. Compare Matt. 20 : 28; Acts 20 : 28; 1 Cor. 6 : 20; 1 Peter 1 : 18, 19. Beck well concludes: "So far, therefore, as Christ's work was accomplished in his self-offering, as the holy and righteous one, he was himself the price paid, the *λύτρον*; and so far as he by that self-offering entered truly into the place of all men, even into the death penalty attaching to human sin, in order to bring men exactly and truly into his own place in relation to God—thereby is he *ἀντίλυτρον*." **To**

7 Whereunto I am ordained a preacher, and an apostle, (I speak the truth in Christ, *and* lie not,) a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity.
8 I will therefore that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting.

7 *to be borne* in its own times; whereunto I was appointed a [1]preacher and an apostle (I speak the truth, I lie not), a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth.
8 I desire therefore that the men pray in every place, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and

1 Gr. *herald.*

be testified in due time, or, *the testimony* (appointed) *for its own times.* This is in apposition to the whole preceding statement in the verse. That God is the God of all men, Gentiles as well as Jews, and that Christ is the one Mediator between God and all mankind, having offered himself a ransom for all—is the testimony to be borne in the Christian ages. This forms the grand message of the Christian ministry; they are to proclaim the fullness and freeness of salvation in the gospel, as sufficient for, and offered to, all men, of every race and clime and tongue under heaven. This universality, alike in the provision and in the offer of salvation in Christ, is "the mystery which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto the holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit, that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel." (Eph. 3 : 3-9.)

7. Whereunto I am ordained, etc. *Unto which* (testimony) *I was appointed a herald and an apostle.* For the proclamation and establishment of this great truth—THE GOSPEL FOR ALL MEN—Paul was specially called and sent forth; and in testifying to that momentous fact, he is first a herald, or proclaimer, and secondly, an apostle, one personally selected by Christ as an authorized representative of him and an inspired expounder of his gospel. **I speak the truth in Christ, and lie not.** The best manuscripts, except the Sinaitic, omit "in Christ" here. This protestation of truthfulness was not needed to assure Timothy, but was important in accrediting him to others as an assistant of a genuine apostle, especially in view of the opposition to Paul's apostolic character and authority, often evoked by his assertion of the universality of the offer of salvation. Compare Rom. 9 : 1; 2 Cor. 11 : 31. **A teacher of the Gentiles**—a further emphasis of the distinctive position God had given him as the apostle to the Gentiles and of the consequent universality of the gospel; from which necessarily follows the duty of prayer for all men, the main subject of the passage. **In faith and verity**—showing the sphere or element in which he exercised the office of teacher of the Gentiles; it was in the faith on Christ and in the truth of the gospel. This was the substance, as well as the subject, of his teaching.

8-15. POSITION AND DUTIES OF THE SEXES IN THE WORSHIP OF THE PUBLIC ASSEMBLY. —1. *Of the men.* On them is devolved the service of prayer, respecting which it is required that it be performed (1) only by men of blameless lives and (2) without anger and disputation. (8.) 2. *Of the women.* (1) They are to observe modesty in apparel and propriety in deportment, being distinguished for good works rather than for costly array. (2) They are to keep silence, inasmuch as the office of teaching in the public assembly of the church is not permitted them. (9–15.) This restriction of the ministerial office to men is explained: such a function would be inconsistent with that subordination of the woman to the man which is involved (*a*) in the creation of the woman subsequent to, and as a helpmeet for, the man, and (*b*) in the precedence of the woman in the fall, and the greater relative weakness of nature therein shown. But woman, though thus denied a public, official, position as teacher of the church, is not denied salvation, but shall attain it, not in the exercise of public functions, but while filling her normal position in the family and home life.

8. I will therefore—the language of authority, not merely of wish; it was his will as an apostle. As he resumes here the subject introduced (ver. 1-3), but interrupted by a digression (ver. 4-7), the word *therefore* is added to mark the resumption. **That** (*the*) **men pray every where.** 'Men' in the Greek has the article, *the men* to emphasize the restriction of prayer in the public assembly to men. Probably at Ephesus, as elsewhere, in the absence of church edifices, the church had different places of meeting; but 'every where,'

9 In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with braided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array;
10 But (which becometh women professing godliness) with good works.

9 [1]disputing. In like manner that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefastness and sobriety; not with braided hair, and gold or pearls
10 or costly raiment; but (which becometh women pro-

1 Or, *doubting*.

or, *in every place* in which it assembled for worship, prayer was to form a part of the service, and the offering of it was a function devolved on the men. **Lifting up holy hands**—at once intimating a common bodily attitude in prayer, uplifted hands, and defining the character required in those who officiated in it. (2 Chron. 6:12; Ps. 28:2; 63:5; 134:2; 141:2.) They must be men whose hands are unstained with wrong. This is a frequent figure for uprightness, purity of life. (Job 17:9; Ps. 24:4; James 4:8.) The Hebrews washed their hands before offering worship. (Ps. 26:6.) The church is "a holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifice acceptable to God by Jesus Christ"; and no man may venture to exercise this priestly function, in offering before God the worship of the Christian assembly, unless his character and life befit the profession of godliness. Clemens Romanus, the contemporary of Paul, wrote to the Corinthian Church: "Let us come to him in holiness of soul, lifting up to him pure and undefiled hands." (Epistle 1:29.) **Without wrath and doubting** (or, *disputation*). 'Wrath' expresses the inward passion, 'disputation' the outward manifestation of it in angry discussion. The worship of the church is not to be offered amidst angry wranglings, which presuppose a state of mind unfitted to such a service, and can only bring discredit on it. (Matt. 5:21-24; 6:14, 15; 1 Peter 3:7.) Thus substantially Bloomfield, Huther, Van Oosterzee, Wiesinger, and Wordsworth. Ellicott, however, prefers the rendering of our version, "doubting" to "disputation," with whom Alford, Fairbairn, and Beck concur. Compare in this sense, Mark 6:24; James 1:6, 7.

9. In like manner also—as he had before declared his apostolic will respecting the position and function of men in public worship, he now 'in like manner' points out the proper sphere and deportment of women in it. In the case of both, the directions relate to the public assembly of the church. **That women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety**—their apparel is to be neither gaudy nor slovenly, but well ordered, decorous, such as befits the womanly and Christian character; and their deportment is to be marked by modesty and discretion. Wordsworth has well defined 'shamefacedness' (or, *shamefastness*, as in Revised Version), as that "inner grace of reverence . . . especially self-reverence, which shrinks from anything unseemly and impure," and 'sobriety' as "that soundness of mind, which regulates and controls all inordinate desires, and exercises a dignified self-restraint on the actions and deportment." This last word is explained by Ellicott: "sobermindedness," or "the well-balanced state of mind, arising from an habitual self-restraint." **Not with braided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array**—'braided hair,' or *plaitings*, referring probably, not to the mere braiding or plaiting of the hair, but to the custom then prevalent in fashionable life, of interweaving in the hair gold, silver, pearls, causing it to flash brilliantly in the light. 'Gold': the chains, rings, bracelets, and anklets, with which the female was often laden. Compare Isa. 3:16–24, for a graphic description of female extravagance in ornament, and the prophet's denunciation of it. Here, as in 1 Peter 3:3–5, all outward ornaments are not forbidden, but only that excess in their use which marks a frivolous mind anxious for display. Their outward adorning is not to be their distinguishing mark.

10. But (which becometh women professing godliness) with good works—they shall adorn themselves, not in costly array, but by means of good works. Their chief distinction, as they appear in the church of God, shall be one of character, derived from deeds of charity and self-denying labors in the work of religion. Such adorning alone 'becometh,' or *befits* them as 'professing godliness,' or piety toward God, who regards, not the outward appearance, but the inward character and the actual life. 'Godliness' (θεοσέβεια, a word not

11 Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection.
12 But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.
13 For Adam was first formed, then Eve.
14 And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.

11 fessing godliness) through good works. Let a
12 woman learn in quietness with all subjection. But
I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have
13 dominion over a man, but to be in quietness. For
14 Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was
not beguiled, but the woman being beguiled hath

elsewhere used in the New Testament): it denotes *reverence toward God*, an attitude of mind which should lead to modesty in apparel when appearing before him. "Their life, not dead articles of apparel, shall be their adorning; and this living adorning comes only through the practice of good works." (Beck.) The connection is rightly given by Calvin: "If piety must be attested in works, then the profession of it ought to appear in the chasteness of the apparel."

11. Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. The position of woman in the public worship of the church is here defined. It is that of a silent learner, in manner and in act yielding subjection in all lawful respects to the authority that God has given to man as leader of worship in the assembly of the church. This is laid down as a rule universal in the churches. (1 Cor. 14:34, 35.) The gospel had elevated the position of woman, and given her a share in the ordinances and a place in the assembled church. The great truth, so new to the ancient world, that in the kingdom of God "there is neither male nor female . . . but all are one in Christ Jesus," had lifted the sex to a higher plane; and it might well occur that, in using the liberty thus conferred, some, especially in a city like Ephesus, would seek to exercise functions inconsistent with the original and unchangeable position of subordination that God had appointed for the sex.

12. But I suffer not a woman to teach —that is, to exercise the office of teacher, or preacher, in the church. The whole passage relates to the public worship of the church; the context, therefore, plainly limits the word 'teach,' as used here, to teaching, or preaching, in the public assembly. **Nor to usurp authority over the man.** A reason for the preceding prohibition. The position of teacher, or preacher, in the public congregation in itself implies superiority or authority over those who are taught; and the functions of this office are, therefore, forbidden to woman, as inconsistent with the subordinate position that God assigned her. The apostle thus teaches that the repulsion which is felt in a well-constituted mind at the appearance of woman in such a position is not the result of mere education or prejudice, but is natural, springing from an instinctive sense of its impropriety as a violation of natural order. **But to be in silence.** Referring still solely to her position and duty in the public assembly of the church.

13, 14. For Adam was first formed, then Eve—a proof of the subordination of woman to man as seen in the order of their creation; the man was first created, and only afterward, and as supplementary, the woman. "*First*, so that the woman was created for him." (Bengel.) The sense is more fully expressed (1 Cor. 11:7-9), "For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man." **And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, was in the transgression.** A second proof of woman's subordination, as also a reason for her subjection, is that, in the temptation, her greater weakness was manifest, in that, while Adam was not deceived, she was completely deceived by the tempter. The serpent, recognizing the greater weakness of her nature, assailed her and not the man (Gen. 3:1); and she, being fully deceived, has come into transgression. She was thus first in the transgression, and that through a pliancy of nature which, it is implied, the serpent did not expect in the man, and would not have found in him. The man, on the other hand, was not thus deceived, but only yielded to sin when the tempter, through the woman's fall, had gained the higher vantage ground of approaching him through her persuasions, and of influencing him through the love he bore her. (Gen. 3:12, 17.) The man and the woman both sinned; but the woman was the more susceptible to deception, yielding to a temptation lower in form and less in power. Eve, the first woman, is here regarded as representative of her sex, showing in her weakness the relative inferiority of

woman in that form of intellectual and moral strength required for leadership and the exercise of authority; but it is obvious that this is not inconsistent, either with her superiority to man in those qualities which specially distinguish her within her true sphere, or with the many and marked exceptions in which the female nature has proved itself superior, alike in penetration to detect and expose deception, and in power to resist and overcome temptation. There is here, also, perhaps a reminiscence of the sentence pronounced on the woman (Gen. 3 : 16): "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." Compare 1 Cor. 11 : 3–15; Eph. 5 : 22–24.

The passage plainly denies to woman the office of the ministry, or the function of prayer and instruction in the public assemblies of the church, on the ground that such an office, as it involves authority over the man, is inconsistent with the divinely-constituted nature and position of woman as subordinate to man. The proofs of this subordination are two: 1. It is indicated by the order of their creation, —'Adam was first formed, then Eve,'—where, however, the proofs of woman's inferior position is not found merely in her later creation, but rather in the cause of it; namely, that her creation was in order to supply a need of the man, and that, in effecting it, she was taken out of him. (Gen. 2 : 18-24; 1 Cor. 11 : 7-9.) She was, therefore, only a complement of the man; a subsequent, and not a primary, figure in the transaction. 2. The subordination of woman, in nature and position, further appears in the fall, in that the serpent, recognizing her relative weakness, assailed, not the man, but the woman; and in that, completely deceived, she yielded, and thus came first into transgression. These reasons, founded on the original constitution and nature of the woman, are plainly valid in all places and in all ages; and the rule excluding woman from the office of the ministry in the church, of which they form the ground, is consequently universal and perpetual. Resting on the primal relation God established between the sexes, it is unrestricted by time and place, and remains in force for all the ages. This rule, however, requiring the silence of women in the public worship of God, can only by a most arbitrary interpretation be applied to her in the informal, social meeting. Plainly it is only in the official position of the public teacher of the church she would 'usurp authority over the man'; and the inhibition, therefore, has its natural limitation to the functions of the ministerial office. In spirit, indeed, it would forbid to woman, in any mixed assembly, an arrogant, declamatory, or didactic mode of address, as unsuited to her nature and relations; but nothing in the language or connection here can properly be construed as forbidding her, in the informal social gatherings of Christians, the utterance of her heart experiences in the communion of saints, and the outbreathing of her spiritual desires in communion with God, provided it be done in a manner befitting the modesty and gentleness of her sex. Indeed, many examples show that public prayer and address were not forbidden to woman on all occasions, as that of Anna in the temple (Luke 2 : 38), and that of Mary and the women assembled with the one hundred and twenty. (Acts 1 : 14.) The apostle elsewhere refers, without rebuke, to women praying and prophesying in the church, and prescribes the manner in which they should do this. (1 Cor. 11 : 3-16.) [May not the apostle refer, in 1 Cor. 11 : 3–16, to small, social meetings of Christians wherein thought and feeling were expressed in a conversational manner? This interpretation was accepted by Meyer in the last edition of his commentary, and it brings the passage into harmony with his direction in 1 Cor. 14: 34–36. That Christians often met in small groups in private houses is evident from several passages of the New Testament, and it certainly is possible that Paul had in mind such meetings.—A. H.] The plain import of the passage here is, therefore, woman, being subordinate to man, should fill no office and exercise no function in the church involving authority over man; but neither the language here, nor the analogy of other Scripture, allows an interpretation forbidding her participation in public exercises consistent with the subordinate position of her sex, although without doubt her chief sphere, as here indicated, is the home life.

15. Notwithstanding—that is, that she came thus into transgression—**she shall be saved in** (or, *through*) **childbearing**—that is, the 'childbearing' decreed in God's sentence on her, "In sorrow shalt thou bring forth children" (Gen. 3 : 16), which, as the special

15 Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.

15 fallen into transgression: but she shall be saved through [1] her childbearing, if they continue in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety.

CHAPTER III.

THIS *is* a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work.

1 [2]Faithful is the saying, If a man seeketh the office

1 Or, *the childbearing*.....2 Some connect the words *Faithful is the saying* with the preceding paragraph.

sorrow of her appointed lot, is selected here as characterizing her whole sphere in life; namely, the home, in its privacy and sanctity, rather than the public assembly, in its utterances of worship and instruction. 'Notwithstanding' her sin, she shall find salvation; yet not through using the functions and usurping the authority of man, but through abiding in the sphere and performing the functions God has appointed her. "A holy married life, with the bearing and training of children, is, as a rule, the appointed path for women; and it will end in their salvation in spite of their original weakness, if that path be humbly and faithfully pursued." (Conybeare.) "*Childbearing* evidently denotes the sphere which properly belongs to the woman, and thus stands in opposition to the sphere of public teaching, which she enters only by usurpation." (Wiesinger.) Thus Bengel, De Wette, Huther, Beck, and most expositors. Wordsworth, however, interprets: "*Saved through the childbearing*—that is, through the blessed childbearing of the promised SEED OF THE WOMAN, the second Adam, Jesus Christ." With this concur, for substance. Doddridge, Macknight, Ellicott, and Fairbairn. **If they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.** Lest they might conceive of the peculiar functions of their life as the means of their obtaining salvation, rather than as the sphere in which it is to be attained, the apostle here states the means on which their salvation is conditioned: they must first possess, and then continue in, faith and love and holiness, with self-restraint, or sobermindedness.

Note: The apostle here, as elsewhere, assumes that the Mosaic account of the creation and fall is, not only in substance, but in detail, historically true. He has here distinctly based on the statements recorded in Genesis his argument respecting the relative position of the sexes in the church through all ages. Indeed, the entire Pentateuch, in all its essential facts and in the forms of expression it employs, is uniformly treated by Christ and his apostles as authentic and historic, a course absolutely inconceivable, if it were either mythical or allegorical in character, or a post-exilian composition falsely ascribed to Moses. See Matt. 22: 31, 32; Mark 10: 3; John 3: 14; 7: 19; 8: 58; Rom. 4: 3; 10: 5; 1 Cor. 10: 2; 2 Cor. 3: 7; Gal. 3: 8.

Ch. 3: 1-7. QUALIFICATIONS REQUIRED IN A PASTOR.—He who aspires to this office is desiring an honorable work; in him, therefore, the following qualifications are required: 1. An irreproachable Christian character, unblemished by vices and adorned by the Christian virtues. (2, 3.) 2. A wise and firm guidance and rule in his own family, as the pledge of his ability to preside over the church. (4, 5.) 3. A maturity of Christian experience and character, sufficient to insure that his elevation to the office will not serve to inflate his pride and thus work his injury. (6.) 4. A good reputation outside of the church, so that, resting under no reproach, his influence in the office may not be impaired, and he may not thereby fall into the snare of the devil. (7.)

1. This is a true saying (or, *faithful is the saying*)—an expression found chiefly in the Pastoral Epistles, designed to emphasize the following statement as important and worthy of confidence. **If a man desire,** or, *seek*—literally, *stretches himself out after;* that is, *aspires to*, the aspiration here being not necessarily other than an honorable one. Compare Heb. 11: 16. The word may denote that longing desire for the work of preaching the gospel which is the primary evidence of a divine call to it, and without which there is no real fitness for it. It is probable that in the Ephesian Church there were those who thus aspired to the pastoral office. **The office of a bishop**—in the Greek, only a single word (ἐπισκοπή); literally, *oversight.* It denotes in

2 A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach;

2 of a [1]bishop, he desireth a good work. The [1]bishop therefore must be without reproach, the husband of one wife, temperate, soberminded, orderly, given to

[1] Or, *overseer*.

Scripture: 1. *The act of visitation*, as when God visits men, either for blessing, as "the time of thy visitation" (Luke 19:44), or for judgment. (Isa. 10:3.) 2. The office of an overseer (ἐπίσκοπος). Here, as the context shows, it is used in the latter sense, and characterizes the office by its chief work, the oversight or care of the church. The word *pastor*, as at present used, is the equivalent of 'bishop' (ἐπίσκοπος), as used in the New Testament. **He desireth a good work**—not merely a good position or dignity, but a good *work;* an occupation which is morally excellent, alike in its object and in its exercise, a vocation worthy of one's aspiration, in the beneficence and grandeur of its purpose and in the purity and excellence of its nature.

The word here translated 'bishop' (ἐπίσκοπος) was "the name given in Athens to the men sent into subdued States to conduct their affairs." (Cremer.) In the New Testament it is used as follows: The verb (ἐπισκοπέω) from which it is derived is found twice—Heb. 12:15: "*Looking diligently*, lest any man fail of the grace of God," and 1 Peter 5:2: "Feed the flock of God, which is among you, *taking the oversight* thereof, not by constraint, but willingly." In the second instance it refers to the pastor's office. The noun (ἐπίσκοπος) is found five times, in four of which it designates a pastor, or overseer, of a church (Acts 20:28; Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:2; Titus 1:7), and in one Christ as the Pastor, or Overseer, of the whole church. (1 Peter 2:25.) The terms bishop and elder in the New Testament are plainly used as designations of the same officer; the distinction between them, elevating the bishop in rank above the elder, is post-apostolic and wholly unknown in Scripture. The evidence of this is as follows: 1. These terms are repeatedly used as interchangeable, as Acts 20:15, 28; Titus 1:5–7; 1 Peter 1:2. 2. The qualifications and duties required of them are identical, as 1 Tim. 3:1–7; Titus 1:5–9. 3. Ordination, which has been claimed as a special prerogative of bishops, in the later sense of the word, was plainly conferred by the eldership, or presbytery, 1 Tim. 4:14. 4. *Elder*, derived from Jewish usage, emphasizes the dignity of the office, while *bishop*, taken from the Greek, points out its peculiar work as one of oversight; both terms were, therefore, naturally in common use, as designating different aspects of the one office. Jerome says: "A presbyter, therefore, is the same as a bishop, and before these were, by the devil's instigation, parties in religion, and it was said among the people: 'I am of Paul,' and 'I of Apollos,' and 'I of Cephas'; the churches were governed by the common council of the presbyters." ("Com. on Titus.") This view of the identity of the bishop and presbyter, or elder, in the New Testament, has now the sanction of nearly all scholars, English and German, Episcopal and non-Episcopal, and ought to be regarded as settled.

2. A bishop then. Such being the exalted nature of a pastor's office and work, he proceeds to show, as an inference therefrom, the qualifications necessary for it. **Must be blameless**—literally, one who in wrestling gives his adversary no hold on him; hence, one who gives no occasion of reproach, irreproachable in character and conduct. **The husband of one wife**—not that he *must* be a married man, although the passage, contrary to the Romish dogma of the celibacy of the clergy, clearly implies that a pastor in the apostolic churches was usually a married man, and perhaps, as Huther suggests, "there is at bottom a pre-supposition that it is better for a bishop to be married than to be unmarried." But the requirement is that, if married, he must have but one wife. The question then occurs, whether this forbids, in the candidate for the pastoral office, that he have more than one wife at the same time, or that he remarry after his first wife's death. Is it polygamy or is it remarriage that is here prohibited?

The latter view, that it forbids remarriage, was, in accordance with the prevailing ascetic tendency, very early taken by some in the patristic churches. It has always prevailed in the Greek and the Oriental Churches, and is defended by many eminent Protestants, as Bloomfield, Wiesinger, Van Oosterzee, Hu-

ther, Alford, Ellicott, Wordsworth, and Fausset. The grounds of this view may be briefly summarized as follows: 1. That no evidence exists of polygamy in the apostolic churches; there was, therefore, no need of its prohibition in the ministry. 2. That a general sentiment then prevailed against second marriages, especially by persons engaged in a sacred work, as is plain from the prohibition of it in the Pagan priesthood, and from the frequent condemnation of it in the patristic literature. Abstinence from it in the Christian ministry would, therefore, be naturally required as a matter of expediency, that the common sentiment of society might not be offended. 3. It is generally added, however, that the rule, as it was thus based, not on an immutable moral principle, but on temporary expediency, is not now imperative, in the changed condition of modern public sentiment. The other interpretation, however, making it forbid polygamy, or the having of more than one living wife, is by far the more natural, alike from the language and the circumstances. It was held among the Fathers by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Jerome, Oecumenius, and Theophylact, and among Protestants has been advocated by Calvin, Henry, Scott, Barnes, Fairbairn, and Beck. It rests on the following considerations: 1. According to Rom. 7 : 2–4, death absolutely sunders the marriage bond, leaving the survivor wholly free, as if never before married, to enter into a new marriage relation. Consequently the man who marries again, after being bereft by death of his former wife, is, in the Pauline conception, still only "the husband of one wife." The apostle could never conceive of such a person as having more than one wife; and he can, therefore, by no just construction of language, be conceived here as regarding a remarriage as disqualifying for the pastorate. 2. Remarriage, after the death of the wife, cannot be in itself wrong, since the apostle expressly sanctions the remarriage of widows (1 Cor. 7 : 8, 9, 39), and, in the case of the younger widows, directly enjoins it. (5 : 14.) Now, as there is no principle which would distinguish, in this respect, the case of the woman from that of the man, the same rule must apply to both. This argument is strengthened, also, when the apostle's emphasis on the universal right of marriage is considered. "Marriage is honourable in *all*." (Heb. 13 : 4.) 3. Polygamy was at that time not uncommon, both among Jews and Gentiles, especially in the East; and, sanctioned by exalted examples in the Old Testament, there was danger that it might find a permanent place in the Christian Church. "Even in the time of Justin we find the Rabbins practicing polygamy" ("Dial. cum Tryph." page 226, ed. Pan); "the Emperor Theodosius enacted a special law, anno 393, forbidding polygamy to the Jews" (Tholuck, on Sermon on the Mount, Matt. 5 : 31).

But, as it was the purpose of the gospel to elevate the female sex and restore the marriage relation to its original condition (Matt. 19 : 3-12), as the union of one man to one woman, it was in the highest degree probable that polygamy would be forbidden in a church officer. For if, as is altogether probable, some such polygamous families had been converted, and the difficulties and hardships attending their separation had led to their temporary tolerance in the church, still it might be expected that men in such polygamous relations, though tolerated in private station, would be excluded from those public, official positions, in which Christianity was expected to be more conspicuously exemplified. Besides, the lax laws of divorce, and the still more lax usages of society in regard to divorce then prevalent among both Jews and Gentiles, made it a not unusual fact that a married man had several former wives still living, who, having been divorced on some other than the one Scriptural ground, were in the sight of God still his wives. Now such a man, when converted, might find it impossible to rectify the false marital relations thus formed, and might, nevertheless, be allowed a place in the church; but it is plain that he could not be put in the conspicuous and responsible position of a pastor. [If we bear in mind the following facts: (1) that no cases of actual polygamy in the early churches are reported—that is, no instances of men living with two or more women as their wives at the same time; (2) that the practice of divorce for *unscriptural reasons* was alarmingly frequent—more frequent, indeed, than at almost any other period in history; (3) that the apostle gives the same rule in the same form of expression respecting a widow (5 : 9), who can-

3 Not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous;
4 One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity;

3 hospitality, apt to teach; [1]no brawler, no striker
4 but gentle, not contentious, no lover of money; one that ruleth well his own house, having *his* children

1 Or, *not quarrelsome over wine.*

not be supposed to have lived with more than one husband at the same time, or to have been rejected by Paul for marrying again after the death of her husband, but who may, by improper divorce, have had more than one husband—it appears safe to assume that the apostle had in view those, and those only, who might properly be regarded by Christians as having more than one wife, because they had effected divorce for insufficient reasons, and had taken a second wife. See a fuller examination of these passages in the editor's "Scriptural Law of Divorce," pp. 61–70.—A. H.] 4. There is no adequate evidence that remarriage was forbidden to the Pagan priesthood, nor that a common sentiment existed against it, either in the Greek or Roman population in the apostolic age. The popular sentiment which prevailed against it at a later period was based on the false asceticism which afterward arose as Christianity became corrupted. It seems clear, therefore, that the disqualification here intended is not remarriage after the death of a wife, but polygamy, or the having at the same time more than one living wife.

Vigilant. The word denotes one who is abstinent, especially as regards the use of wine or strong drink, but, in a derived sense, one who is watchful over all his appetites and passions, to hold them in due restraint. **Sober** (*σώφρων*)—*of sound mind;* one who has at once sound sense and sound morals, in whom the moral understanding dominates the lower nature, and the man is hence sound minded. self-restrained, discreet. **Of good behaviour** (*κόσμιος*)—referring to the outward deportment; orderly, decorous, a kind, courteous man, a Christian gentleman. The word denotes that which is *well ordered*, and thus, in some connections, *modest*, as ch. 2 : 9.[1] **Given to hospitality**—hospitable, ready to entertain strangers: a duty specially important in the social conditions of ancient times, when Christians could not find entertainment at the public inns without danger, either of insult or of complicity with idolatry. (Rom. 12: 13; Titus 1 : 10; Heb. 13 : 2; 1 Peter 4 : 9.) **Apt to teach**—including both the disposition or the love for teaching, and the ability or skill for it. The minister, then, must neither be ignorant nor undisciplined; for how can one be "apt to teach" whose mind is unstored with knowledge and untrained to impart it? (2 Tim. 2 : 24-26.)

3. Not given to wine—literally, *not with wine.* The word, by usage, marks the person, not only as addicted to wine, but also as in the condition of character and life resulting from such a habit, "including drunkenness and its manifestation"; hence, a *brawler*, or violent, disorderly person. **No striker**—not a man of violent, combative disposition, perhaps including here the bodily manifestation of it. He must be one who has his temper under control, not moved by passion, but ready to "show all meekness to all men." **Not greedy of filthy lucre.** This is not found in the older manuscripts, but is probably interpolated from Titus 1 : 7, where it properly belongs. Thus nearly all, except Beck. **But patient, not a brawler.** *Forbearing and uncontentious*, the two attributes standing in contrast with the disposition of the "striker." The pastor is not to be a hasty, passionate, violent man, but to possess a spirit of gentleness, averse to dispute and quarrel. (2 Tim. 2 : 24.) **Not covetous**—free from avarice, or greed of worldly gain, with perhaps a retrospective reference to the requirement, "given to hospitality." "Covetousness is bad in any, but worst in a minister whose calling leads him to converse so much with another world." (Henry.)

4. One that ruleth well his own house—or, presides well over his own household. **Having his children in subjection.** His character and government at home must be such as to secure a well-ordered household, in which the children are in habitual subjection. The duty and importance of a wise and firm family government are constantly taught in Scripture (Gen. 18 : 19; Ps. 101 : 2; Prov. 22 : 6; Eph. 5 : 4), and the sad results of failure in this find illus-

1 "What *σώφρων* is within, that *κόσμιος* is without." (Bengel.)

5 (For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?)
6 Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil.
7 Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil.

5 in subjection with all gravity; (but if a man knoweth not how to rule his own house, how shall he
6 take care of the church of God?) not a novice, lest being puffed up he fall into the [1] condemnation of
7 the devil. Moreover he must have good testimony from them that are without; lest he fall into

1 Gr. *judgment.*

tration in the case of Eli. (1 Sam. 3:11-14.) **With all gravity.** Referred by Van Oosterzee, Beck, Hofmann, and others to the father, as marking the dignity of manner befitting him in the family; but it seems more naturally here to characterize the bearing and deportment of the children, "with reverent modesty," as it is understood by most. Compare Titus 1:6.

5. For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God? An argument parenthetically interposed. A pastor is to preside over the church, as a father presides over his household; the success of the candidate in the narrower sphere of his own home, is, therefore, a proper test of his adaptation to success in the wider sphere of the church. If he has failed in the less charge, he is clearly unfit for the greater. Here, as everywhere in the New Testament, in describing the work of a pastor, emphasis is placed, not merely on the preaching function, but also on the presiding, governing function. (Heb. 13:17; 1 Pet. 5:1-4.)

6. Not a novice—literally, *one newly planted*, a neophyte, a recent convert. **Lest, being lifted up with pride** (or, *self-conceit*)—literally, *lest being filled, or enveloped, with smoke;* that is, his self-conceit, like smoke, darkening his vision, so that he does not see clearly his own weakness and danger, and thus stumbles into some trap set for him by the adversary. "*Wrapt in smoke*, so that, inflated with self-conceit and exaggerated ideas of his own importance, he cannot see himself and others in the true light." (Fausset.) (1 Tim. 6:4; 2 Tim. 3:4.) **He fall into the condemnation of the devil**—that is, the condemnation into which the devil fell. Throughout Scripture, as in 2 Peter 2:4; Jude 6, the fall and condemnation of angels appear as originating in a pride which led to self-will and rebellion; and the new convert, suddenly elevated to a post of distinction in the church, was in danger thereby of a self-conceit that might lead to his destruction. For "pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall." (Prov. 16:18.) "We should take heed of pride, because it is a sin that turned angels into devils." (Henry.) Doubtless, there is so wide a difference in the age, character, and tendencies of recent converts, that no fixed rule is possible, as to the length of time which should elapse before any one can properly be admitted to the ministry; but the most imperative considerations demand that careful heed be given to this prohibition, for the welfare, alike of the convert himself, and of the Church of God. The wrecks of many a Christian character, thus destroyed, lie all along the course of Christian history, and emphasize the warning "Lay hands hastily on no man." (5:22.)

7. Moreover, he must have a good report of them that are without—that is, of those who are not members of the church. In the selection of a pastor, regard must be had to the reputation he has in the general community, as to his truthfulness, integrity, and purity of life. His character and life among men must be such as to inspire confidence, so that, in discharging the duties of his office, he may commend himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God. (2 Cor. 4:2.) This care in reference to the general reputation of church officers is elsewhere enjoined and exemplified. (Acts 6:3; 16:2; 2 Cor. 6:3, 4; 1 Thess. 4:12.) **Lest he fall into reproach.** The reproach resulting from his previous ill-repute, which would be intensified by his elevation to the conspicuous position of a pastor. Or the reference may be to the reproach occasioned by a possible relapse into those evil courses, which had already alienated from him the confidence of the people. **And the snare of the devil.** The minister's own moral power is weakened if he is conscious that his course of life has been such as to alienate from him the confidence of the community; such an one, therefore, should not be set apart to the office, because he would be thereby more exposed to fall, by the temptation either to seek the popular favor by false methods, or to defy public opinion by a bold

continuance in evil courses. It is evident, also, that no man whose character is under reproach, or even serious suspicion, can ever accomplish in a community the true work of a Christian pastor, however brilliant may be his talents, or attractive his social qualities.

The qualifications here required in the pastor belong, as in the related passages, 2 Tim. 2: 15-26; Titus 1: 5-9, rather to the realm of the common, homely virtues than to that of intellect and learning. These grand moral characteristics, as forming the foundation of ministerial character and usefulness, must distinguish the ministry in all ages and all lands; and, while the intellectual gifts and culture of the pulpit will differ in different individuals and at different times, the presence of the moral qualities here specified is always and everywhere an essential condition of admission to the office. It is the duty, therefore, of a church before electing a pastor, and of a presbytery before ordaining him, to ascertain whether these qualifications are found in the candidate. His moral dispositions; his self-government; his spirit and life at home and abroad; the reputation he has, as a man and a Christian, outside of the church—all these are points of chief moment in the qualifications of a pastor. The primal question to be asked, therefore, is not "Is he talented? Is he learned? Is he eloquent? Is he social?" but far more, "Is he thoroughly Christian in character, and godly in life?" For in the pastoral office, while gifts are important, grace is essential. Moral and spiritual qualifications, however, though fundamental, are not the only conditions of admission to the pastoral office, for the apostle requires also that a man be 'apt to teach.' Elsewhere, also, he gives charge that God's word be committed only to "faithful men, who shall be *able to teach others* also," "in meekness *instructing* those that oppose themselves," "*able* by sound doctrine *to exhort and convince* the gainsayers"; and that the minister show himself "approved of God, a *workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly* dividing the word of truth." (2 Tim. 2: 2, 15, 25; Titus 1: 9.) The pastor's work is to unfold and enforce truth in the pulpit, as well as to illustrate it in holy living. Piety, therefore, essential as it is, if not accompanied with mental gifts and discipline, is not evidence of a ministerial call.

8-13. QUALIFICATIONS REQUIRED IN DEACONS.—They must be: 1. Men of dignified deportment, truthful, temperate and liberal. (8.) 2. Men who hold the gospel in a pure conscience. (9.) 3. Men who have been tested and have shown themselves qualified, in character and ability, for the office. The deaconesses, who were probably often chosen from the wives of the deacons, the apostle adds, must possess the same moral qualifications, in general, as the deacons. (10, 11.) 4. Deacons are to be men who have only one living wife, and who preside well over their own households (12). Finally, the value and importance of the deacon's office is seen in the richness of its reward, which is found in the higher advancement in grace and the greater confidence in faith which its right use secures. (13)

The Greek term for deacon (διάκονος) signifies, in general, one who serves, a servant in any capacity; but its special application in the New Testament is to the second class of church officers. Of these the earliest record is found in the appointment of "the seven." (Acts 6: 1-6.) For the work to which the "seven" were set apart—namely, "to serve tables," or supervise the temporal welfare of the Church—is one of universal and permanent necessity, and is designated by the corresponding verb (διακονεῖν), the appropriate word for the work of the deacon's office; while it is also placed in contrast to the work of the ministry, "prayer and the ministry of the word," as being a distinct function. The general sense of Christendom has, therefore, interpreted this as the institution of the diaconate, and the subsequent references to the office in the New Testament confirm this view. The following facts appear in Scripture: 1. It is a permanent office in the church; for not only is the permanent need of such officers evident, but deacons are mentioned with bishops as the ordinary officers, and their qualifications alone, besides those of bishops, are specifically prescribed. See Phil. 1: 1; 1 Tim. 3: 8-13. Compare, also, Rom. 12: 7; 1 Peter 4: 11. 2. They are chosen by the whole congregation of disciples, and are ordained by the ministry. (Acts 6: 5, 6.) The term of service, whether long or short, is not prescribed, and is doubtless to be decided by each church for itself. 3. The duty of the deacons is to administer the temporal affairs of

8 Likewise *must* the deacons *be* grave, not double-
tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy
lucre;
9 Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure con-
science.
10 And let these also first be proved; then let them
use the office of a deacon, being *found* blameless.

8 reproach and the snare of the devil. Deacons in
like manner *must be* grave, not doubletongued, not
9 given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre; hold-
ing the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience.
10 And let these also first be proved; then let them

the church, such as the relief of the poor, the support of public worship, the care of the church property, and the provision for the due administration of the ordinances. This is evident from their original appointment. They were "to serve tables," that is, attend to arrangements for the sustenance of the poor and of the ministry, this being done from a common fund; and their work is thus placed in direct contrast with that of "the twelve," which was "prayer and the ministry of the word." While, therefore, the elders supervise the spiritual welfare of the church, the deacons have the supervision of its temporal interests. In the Episcopal organization of the church, the deacons form the third order of spiritual officers, and are empowered to preach and baptize. They are not "lay," but "clerical" officers. As opposed to this, however, it is significant that, among the qualifications here required for the diaconate, Paul omits, *apt to teach*, and emphasizes those qualities which give special fitness for secular duties, thus, as in its original appointment, broadly distinguishing the office from that of the preacher. It is true that Philip, one of "the seven," preached and baptized; but this occurred some time after his choice to the diaconate, and when he had become an evangelist. (Acts 8: 26-40; 21: 8.)

8. Likewise must the deacons be grave—of dignified character and deportment; serious men, free from levity and frivolity. **Not doubled-tongued**—of double speech, saying one thing to this, and a different to that; or, of deceitful speech, saying one thing, but meaning or doing another. In their official work, they are necessarily in constant intercourse with the members of the church, and prevarication or duplicity in them must be most pernicious in its influence. They are, therefore, to be men of transparent character, truthful in their words and faithful to their promises. **Not given to much wine**—not wine bibbers. Wine and strong drink were forbidden, on pain of death, to the Jewish priests, when engaged in the services of the Tabernacle. (Lev. 10: 9.) They were also prohibited to the heathen priesthood in their temple worship. Much more, then, might we expect that a man addicted to them would be disqualified for official position in the Christian Church. (Ver. 3.) **Not greedy of filthy lucre**—*base gains*. "All gain is filthy (literally, *base*) which is set before a man as a by-end in his work for God." (Alford.) The love of money is especially dangerous in one who, by his office, is placed in trust with the church funds, and is concerned in the administration of them. To a man greedy of gain, the temptation would be great, if not to actual theft, yet to such use of the funds as might further his personal pecuniary interests. Note the case of Judas. See John 12: 6; compare Titus 1: 11; 1 Peter 5: 2.

9. Holding the mystery of the faith. 'Mystery,' in the New Testament, does not ordinarily denote that which is mysterious or difficult to understand, but rather that which was once hidden—a truth, or cycle of truths, which was before undiscovered, but which has now been made known by revelation from God. It denotes here the whole cycle of truths relating to the person and work and salvation of Christ, which, once hidden from men, but now revealed in the gospel, are apprehended and received by faith. Compare Rom. 16: 26; 1 Cor. 2: 7; Gal. 3; 23; Eph. 3: 3-12. **In a pure conscience**—that is, a conscience which has been made free from guilt, and is kept pure, or in conscious integrity, by faith in Christ. The conscience, thus pure, "was to be, as it were, the insphering principle (2 Tim. 1: 3)." (Ellicott.) "The pure conscience is the coffer in which the truth is best deposited." (Van Oosterzee.) "Pure doctrine and pure conscience must always go together." (Hedinger.)

10. And let these also—not "also," as if in addition to the bishops, but rather, *let these, moreover*—that is, in addition to the things already required. **First be proved**—not by any formal procedure, but by a life in the church of sufficient length to test their real

11 Even so *must their* wives *be* grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things.
12 Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well.
13 For they that have used the office of a deacon well purchase to themselves a good degree and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus.

11 serve as deacons, if they be blameless. Women in like manner *must be* grave, not slanderers, temper-
12 ate, faithful in all things. Let deacons be husbands of one wife, ruling *their* children and their own
13 houses well. For they that have served well as deacons gain to themselves a good standing, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus

character and ability. **Then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless.** They are not to be selected from new and untried men, but from those who, after trial, have proved themselves fitted for the office. "The more prominent the place God allots any one, the more blameless should be his life, because many observe him." (Starke.)

11. Even so must their wives. Better, as in the Revised Version: *Women in like manner*—that is, women filling the deacon's office, deaconesses. As the words occur in the midst of a description of the qualifications of deacons, the Anglican Version, as also Conant, translates "their wives," with which accords the view of Calvin, Henry, Barnes, Conybeare, Huther, and others. Decisive reasons, however, seem here to require its reference to the deaconesses, who may, indeed, often have been wives of deacons, but who are here mentioned as the female members of the diaconate. For, 1, it is evident that deaconesses existed in some of the apostolic churches, since we read of Phebe, a deaconess of the church at Cenchrea (Rom. 16: 1), and of certain women who at Philippi labored with Paul in the gospel, and seem to have had an official position. (Phil. 4: 3.) In the post-apostolic churches, this office certainly existed; and, indeed, the seclusion of females in the East, and the peculiar relations of the sexes in Greek cities, must have made such female officers a necessity. 2. *In like manner*, with which this verse begins, is the same transitional word that introduced the directions for the deacons, and in itself suggests the introduction of a class separate from them; and doubtless the verse was introduced at this point, because the qualifications of the deaconesses form, as will be seen, a parallel to those required of the deacons in the immediately preceding verses. 3. The Greek has not '*their* wives,' but simply *women* (γυναῖκες), without article or pronoun, and it is, therefore, properly rendered, not "their wives," but *women*, and, in this context, *female deacons*. 4. It is difficult to see why the qualifications of deacons' wives should be specified, and not also those of bishops' wives; but there was a plain reason for defining the qualifications of the deaconesses, since to them was largely committed the administration of church relief, pecuniary and spiritual, among the female members of the flock. The great body of commentators, therefore, ancient and modern, have understood this passage as relating to deaconesses. **Must be grave**—dignified in deportment, serious, decorous. **Not slanderers**—literally, *not devils*, calumniators, "talebearers, carrying stories to make mischief and sow discord." It "corresponds to the 'double-tongued' (διλόγους), in the males, being the vice to which the female sex is more addicted." (Alford.) **Sober**—parallel to the "not given to much wine" in the men, and perhaps, therefore, to be taken as at least including the physical sense. **Faithful in all things**—placed over against 'greedy of filthy lucre' in the men, and requiring a scrupulous fidelity in the administration of the relief funds of the church, as well as in the discharge of the other duties of the office.

12. Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife. As in the pastor's office, so also in the deacon's, polygamy, or having more than one living wife, is a disqualification. See notes under ver. 2. **Ruling their children and their own houses well.** It seems to be implied that the deacon will ordinarily be a married man and the head of a family, over which he is required so to preside as to secure a well-ordered household. Compare ver. 2, 4.

13. For they that have used the office of a deacon well—better, *They that have served well as deacons*—at once a reason for requiring such qualities in the deacon and an incentive to the earnest and diligent use of them, since a great reward attaches to the office. **Purchase to** (or, *gain for*) **themselves a good degree** (or, *standing*)—literally, *step*, as the step before a door or on a staircase; hence, figuratively, a step upward, an advanced position. Of this *good standing*, or upward step, three different interpretations have been given: 1

14 These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly:

14 These things write I unto thee, hoping to come
15 unto thee shortly; but if I tarry long, that thou

A preferment in the church, as from the deacon's to the pastor's office. 2. An advanced spiritual position in a richer religious experience and an enlarged spiritual power. 3. A higher position at last in the greater reward God will bestow upon his faithful and successful servants, as taught in the parable of the pounds. (Luke 19:11-27.) The second of these, interpreting of an advanced position in Christian experience and life, seems here best suited to the context—at least, as the main thought; since the apostle would hardly present ecclesiastical preferment as a motive to fidelity; and the reference to the higher position of the faithful in heaven, though suitable as a motive, is less consonant with the motive that follows, 'great boldness in the faith,' which plainly relates to the present life. The expression presents, therefore, as a reward of fidelity in the diaconate, a higher standing place in the Christian life in a richer consciousness of union with Christ and a more full realization of the Christian hope, although perhaps the heavenly reward need not be excluded, as it is in full accord with the doctrine of the future reward of believers as taught by Christ (Matt. 19:29; 25:34-40; Luke 19:11-27), and by the apostles (1 Cor. 3:8-15; 2 Cor. 9:6; 2 Tim. 4:7,8; 1 Peter 5:4; 2 John 8). **And great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus**—perhaps not 'in the faith,' but as the Greek is without the article, *in faith*. The right use of the office secures a strong faith or a higher confidence in the exercise of that faith which is based on Christ.

It will be observed that here, as in the case of pastors, the qualifications emphasized are those rather of the homely virtues than of the brilliant gifts. They are qualities of character and life such as evoke the respect and love and confidence of men, and form the essential basis of religious power. The passage thus suggests, not that high culture and brilliant gifts should not be sought in church officers, but that the virtues of a solid character and a pure life are of far higher moment; and that, while the former may sometimes be wanting, the latter ought never to be absent.

Note also that here, as everywhere in the New Testament when permanent officers are mentioned, only two classes appear in the church—pastors and deacons; the qualifications of the one class adapting them to the work of public instruction and spiritual guidance in the church, those of the other fitting them for the wise and safe administration of its temporal concerns. There was no third class; but the qualifications named and instructions given all relate to these two classes only. Evidently there was no prelatical bishop at Ephesus presiding over the diocese of Asia, otherwise the injunctions here given would have been sent to him, and not to Timothy. Certainly Timothy himself was not Bishop of Ephesus, since his office was that of an evangelist (2 Tim. 4:5), traveling as an assistant to Paul (Acts 16:1-3); and he had been, at this time, only temporarily left at Ephesus for a special work (1:3), Paul himself expecting soon to return and relieve him of his charge (3:14,15). Indeed, it is difficult to conceive an assumption more absolutely destitute of Biblical foundation than that which makes Timothy "the first Bishop of Ephesus." A prelate, or hierarchical bishop, as the head of a diocese, is wholly unknown in the New Testament.

14-16. Obedience to the Above Instructions Enforced by the Dignity of the Church, as the House of God, and its Importance as the Pillar and Ground, or Base, of the Truth.—1. Paul, though hoping to come to Timothy soon, yet contemplates delay as possible, and sends, therefore, these instructions, that he may know how to conduct himself in the affairs of the Ephesian Church. (14, 15.) 2. The importance of guiding aright the affairs of the church is shown, (*a*) from the exalted character of the church as "the house of God," "the church of the living God"; (*b*) from the momentous relation of the church to the world, as "the pillar and base of the truth," in conserving and proclaiming divine truth among men; and (*c*) from the sublime character of the truth, thus witnessed by the church, as the 'mystery of Godliness,' or God Incarnate; his life, death, resurrection, and glorification. (15, 16.)

14. These things write I—the foregoing instructions, especially those relating to the qualifications of pastors and deacons. **Hoping to come unto thee shortly** (or, *more*

15 But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.

mayest know [1] how men ought to behave themselves in the house of God, which is the church of the liv-
16 ing God, the pillar and [2] ground of the truth. And

1 Or, *how thou oughtest to behave thyself*.....2 Or, *stay*.

quickly). Circumstances at present portended delay, but he hoped that some change would occur in his situation, allowing him to come sooner than now seemed probable.

15. But if I tarry long (*if, notwithstanding my hope, I am delayed*) **that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave** (or, *conduct*) **thyself**—or, *how men ought to conduct themselves.* The construction admits of either translation, but the former accords better with the scope of this passage. In either case the reference is not to behavior or deportment, but to the course of action to be pursued, that thou mightest know how to act, what course of action is required in conducting the affairs of the church. **In the house of God.** The temple in Israel was "the house of God," because he dwelt in it among his people and his visible presence was there manifested in the Shekinah above the mercy seat in the Holy of Holies. This was typical of the church. In the New Testament his redeemed people constitute his house, he dwelling in them as within a living temple. Hence the church is represented as a building, a glorious structure composed of "living stones," "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord"; "an habitation of God through the Spirit." Eph. 2 : 20–22; compare 1 Cor. 3 : 9–17; 2 Cor. 6 : 16; Heb. 3 : 6; 2 Peter 2 : 5. And as the whole body of his people form his living temple, so also each local church, as composed of believers united by faith to the one Lord, forms 'the house of God,' within which he dwells and reveals his glorious presence. **Which is** (or, *Since it is; inasmuch as it is*) **the church of the living God.** In contrast with the temple made by hands at Ephesus, enshrining the dead image of Diana, this glorious structure, in which Timothy ministered, was "a living community of saints pervaded by the living God." The word *church* (ἐκκλησία) is used in the New Testament one hundred and fifteen times. Of these, in three instances it denotes the legislative assembly of citizens in a free Greek city; in two, the Hebrew "congregation of the Lord"; and in one hundred and ten, the Christian Church. As designating the church, it is used ninety-two times of the local church, as "the church at Jerusalem," "the churches of Galatia"; and eighteen times, either of the whole church, conceived as composed of all the elect, who are to form one grand assembly at last in heaven, or of Christians generally, as in Acts 9 : 31: "Then had *the church* (corrected text) rest throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria." In the text the word refers to the local church at Ephesus, but contemplated (as every true church is, in fact), as a type, a dim but real representation of the universal spiritual church. The ministry of Timothy, and of the pastors and deacons, was concerned with the affairs of this 'church of the living God'; and hence the high qualifications required in them, and the care and order and solemnity which should mark their ministration. **The pillar and ground of the truth.** The apostle, with characteristic rapidity of transition, now changes the figure. The temple is here no longer the church, but the truth—especially the great truth of the incarnation, and of the life, death, resurrection, and universal reign of the God-man; and the church is a column and base of this temple, sustaining it, and bearing it up for the gaze and wonder and faith of men. As a column, with its base, or foundation, sustains and lifts aloft the magnificent temple, displaying its splendor and strength, and the genius and skill of its architect, even thus is each church a column and base of the truth. It is God's chosen institution, by which his truth is upborne and made known through all ages. It is not the author of the truth, nor the authority on which the truth is published; but, receiving the truth from God as given in his word, its office is to conserve and publish it as God's message to men. Without the church, therefore, the truth, unpreserved and unproclaimed, would perish from the earth. Some interpreters make this clause, not appositional with "the church of the living God,"

16 And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.

without controversy great is the mystery of godliness; [1] He who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, received up in glory.

1 The word *God*, in place of *He who*, rests on no sufficient ancient evidence. Some ancient authorities read *which*.

but the beginning of a new sentence—thus, "A pillar and ground of the truth, and confessedly great is the mystery of godliness." But surely the apostle, even in his old age, could hardly have used such rhetoric. The other, and older, construction, is far more Pauline, and is consonant with his purpose here, to unfold the greatness of the church and its mission, in order to impress Timothy and the ministry of all ages with the greatness of their charge and the consequent necessity of high qualifications in those who undertake it.

16. And without controversy—that is, *confessedly;* it is a point that must be acknowledged—**great is the mystery.** 'Mystery' here, as in ver. 9, denotes, not that which cannot be apprehended or understood, but that which was once hidden or unknown; something which the reason could not have discovered, but which can be known only by revelation from God, and which, as a fact of pure revelation, can be received only by faith. This *great* truth, hitherto unrevealed and unknown, had now been made known by the actual incarnation, life, death, resurrection, and glorification of God in man; and of this truth the church is 'the pillar and base.' The conserving and publishing of this momentous truth constitute the mission of the church; and hence the supreme importance of this divine organization as 'the church of the living God' and the care with which its affairs should be conducted. **Of godliness.** This 'mystery'—God taking on him humanity, and living, suffering, dying, rising, and reigning in humanity—is for human souls the source of godliness: in it are all possible motives to holy living. It is this great FACT, fully apprehended and believed in the soul, which breaks the power of sin and quickens to a new life of holiness. The all-potent revelation of the gospel is Christ as GOD-MAN; and from it, as received in the soul, comes all true godliness. For "in it Christ says, 'Be ye holy, for I,' who have taken your nature and joined it to the nature of the Holy One, 'am holy.'" (Wordsworth.) **God** (properly, *who*). For reasons assigned below, I accept as the true reading here, *who* (ὅς), instead of *God* (θεός), in accordance with the decision of the great body of recent Biblical critics. Properly translated, therefore, it is, *who was manifested*, the relative referring to 'mystery' as its logical, though not strictly grammatical, antecedent, because the Son of God, as incarnate, is the dominant thought involved in it.

Was manifest in the flesh—that is, the Son of God entered into personal union with, and revealed himself in, humanity. This is the constant teaching of Scripture: "The Word was made flesh" (John 1:14); "Who, being in the form of God . . . was made in the likeness of men" (Phil. 2:6,7); "The life was manifested; and we have seen, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life which was with the Father and was manifested unto us" (1 John 1:2). The expression presupposes the pre-existence and the divinity of Christ. **Justified**—was shown, proved to be righteous—**in the Spirit**—*the Holy Spirit*, not Christ's spirit, considered as the seat of his divine nature; for here there is no antithesis to "flesh" in the preceding clause, but the clauses follow the simple historical sequence in his manifestation. First, he became incarnate, or 'was manifest in the flesh'; then his divine Sonship was demonstrated by the Holy Spirit, given to him and working in him. He was approved as righteous when, in token that the Father was in him "well-pleased," the Holy Spirit descended on him at the baptism. (Matt. 3:16.) The Father gave "not the Spirit by measure" to him, but in unbounded fullness. He was "led by the Spirit" to his temptation (Matt. 4:1); his mighty works were effected "through the Spirit" (Matt. 12:28); and this presence and power of the Holy Spirit divinely attested him as righteous and authenticated his claims as the Son of God. **Seen of** (or, *appeared to*) **angels**—that is, *made himself visible* to them. The verb, though passive in form, is active in sense. Compare Acts 7:26; 26:16. The Son of man, even in the depths of his humiliation, revealed

himself to angels as the exalted Son of God; and at every step in his earthly path they saw, through the vail of his flesh, the infinite and eternal God. They recognized him even in his lowly birth. (Luke 2:9-14.) They ministered to him in the wilderness temptation, and in Gethsemane. Had he chosen to avoid arrest, "more than twelve legions of angels" would have come to defend him. (Matt. 26:33.) When he had suffered death, these glorious beings were present to witness his resurrection and to grace his triumphant ascension. (Acts 1:10, 11.) He thus, in all the vicissitudes of his earthly life, stood fully revealed before the angelic world as the God-man, and, with adoring wonder, they watched around his path from the manger to the tomb. **Preached unto the Gentiles** (or, *among the nations*). Even during our Lord's life, the salvation he brought passed beyond Israel to other peoples, as in the case of the Syrophenician woman (Mark 7:26), and of the Roman centurion (Luke 7:2-10). Before he ascended, he charged his disciples to go into "all the world and preach the gospel to every creature"; and in the apostolic age Christianity achieved its widest triumphs among the Gentile nations. This was the marvel of that age, that God became Man to provide a salvation for all men, Gentiles as well as Jews. (Acts 11:18; Rom. 10:12, 13; Eph. 2:11-22; 3:8.) **Believed on in the world.** This salvation was actually effectual. Though rejected by the great body of the Jews, there were yet many who believed on him; and these earlier disciples were but the precursors and pledges of the vast multitude who, after the Holy Spirit was given, became believers in Christ and heirs of salvation.

Received up into glory. This was the crowning triumph of Christ, the final proof that he was God incarnate, when, ascended and glorified, he took his seat at God's right hand, and, as the God-man, the divine human King of the universe, received all power in heaven and earth. (Acts 1:9; John 17:5; Eph. 1:19-23; Phil. 2:9-11; Rev. 5:6-14.)

Such is the greatness of that truth of which the church is '*the pillar and base*'; and hence the sacredness of the work, and the required sanctity of character of those who are called to official station in it. This sublime mystery, the personal manifestation of God in man, is here outlined in successive clauses, rhythmic in their structure. Many commentators, therefore, have regarded them as quoted by the apostle from some early confession or hymn used in the apostolic churches. It seems, however, far more natural to think that the language here was original with Paul, and, as a wonderful statement of God manifested in humanity, was afterward adopted as a creed or liturgic form, for which its rhythmic structure so well fitted it. For in Paul, as in all great writers and orators when treating of subjects in their nature sublime, the tendency is to poetic and rhythmic expression. Compare Rom. 8:38, 39; 11:33-36. Farrar versifies as follows: "And confessedly great is the mystery of godliness—who was

> "Manifested in the flesh,
> Justified in the Spirit,
> Seen of angels.
> Preached among the Gentiles,
> Believed on in the world,
> Taken up in glory."

Observe the sublime character and position of the church, and its supreme importance as an outward organization. It is 'the house of God'; not a human organization, constituted and ordered by men and ruled for earthly ends, but an organization of God, constituted according to a divine ideal by a union of redemed souls, and forming a living temple, in which dwells the living God. Its mission is to conserve and publish to the world divine truth, and especially that highest of all truths, the incarnation of the Son of God, and the life, death, resurrection, and glorification of the God-Man as the ground and the pledge of the redemption and glorification of all who believe on him. Apart from this divine organization, that momentous truth might perish from the earth, and salvation fail among men. Indeed, so important is the church that much of the New Testament is occupied with instructions respecting it. It is impossible to think, therefore, that its form and order have been left to men, to be changed from age to age, according to human caprice and shortsightedness, or that those are resting on Scriptural ground who depreciate this great institution of God as a mere outward organization, to be changed or to be dispensed with, as men may decide. Plainly, such was not Paul's conception of 'the church of the living God.'

Note, also, the dignity and solemnity of the

CHAPTER IV.

NOW the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;

1 But the Spirit saith expressly, that in later times some shall fall away from the faith, giving heed to

ministerial office. The ancient Jewish priests ministered in a temple made with hands, and enshrining for ages not even a visible representation of God; for the Shechinah, or visible glory of God, had long since departed, and the Holy of holies was empty. But the ministration of the gospel is performed in this living temple, composed of redeemed souls and pervaded by the presence of the living God, "a habitation of God through the Spirit." How great the necessity, therefore, as the apostle infers, that those who take on them this ministration be men of Christian virtues and of holy lives, and thus be worthy of the gospel they preach and of 'the church of the living God' wherein they serve!

The reading in ver. 16, "*God* was manifested in the flesh," has long been held as doubtful. Manuscript and other authority exist for either *God* (θεός), or *which* (ὅ), or *who* (ὅς). The evidence adduced for the respective readings may be summed up as follows: For *God* (θεός) may be adduced: 1. The uncial codices, D^3, J, H, $\aleph^5$, none of which are earlier than the seventh century, and then as altered in this place by a later hand. 2. Nearly all the cursive manuscripts, which, however, do not date back of about the tenth century. 3. The citation of the passage with this reading by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Euthalius, Macedonius, and other of the later Fathers. For *which* (ὅ) may be urged: 1. The uncial codex D^1 of the seventh century, but only as a correction. 2. The early Latin versions, except Jerome's. For *who* (ὅς) the evidence is: 1. The uncial codices, ℵ, or Sinaitic manuscript, of the fourth century, A and C, of the fifth, and F and G, of the ninth. 2. The important cursive manuscripts, 17, 73, 181, which were copied from uncial manuscripts, probably earlier than any now extant. 3. The Gothic, later Syriac, and Coptic versions; in the Peschito, or earlier Syriac, it is uncertain whether the reading is *who* (ὅς), or *which* (ὅ). 4. The citation of the passage in this form by the Fathers, Cyril, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Epiphanius, Macarius, and Jerome. The preponderance of external evidence is clearly in favor of *who* (ὅς), as the true reading: while on internal grounds it is certainly far easier to conceive that, in the intensity of doctrinal interest, especially in the Trinitarian controversies, God (θεος) would be substituted for who (ὅς), requiring only two slight marks in the uncial text, than that the opposite change should be made. In this result concur all the best critical authorities, as Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort; with De Wette, Huther, Alford, Ellicott, and Fairbairn among interpreters.

Ch. 4: 1-5. A Departure from the Gospel Predicted.—1. The Holy Spirit distinctly predicts a departure from the faith in after times. (1.) 2. The agencies through which this will result are described under two classes: (*a*) The superhuman — "seducing spirits and doctrines of devils"; (*b*) the human —those 'speaking lies in hypocrisy,' described also as "having their conscience seared"; the latter class being the medium in and through which the former exert their power (1, 2). 3. The characteristic doctrines of these misleading teachers are stated; they inculcate, as essential to a higher sanctification, celibacy and abstinence from food which God has adapted for man; whereas all such food is lawful to believers, since it is sanctified by the sanction of God's word and by the prayer of the recipient (3–5).

1. Now—Revised Version, better, *But*. In contrast with "the mystery of godliness," the glorious truth that the church is upbearing before the world (3 : 16), the apostle now speaks of the approach of "the mystery of iniquity" (2 Thess. 2 : 7), whose malignant and destructive workings were even now apparent. **The Spirit speaketh expressly** — *plainly, distinctly.* Whether the reference here is to a special communication to the apostle himself, or to prophecies uttered through other inspired men, is left uncertain. Even in the Old Testament there are predictions, as some suppose, of a great apostasy in the Messianic age. (Dan. 7 : 25; 8 : 23-25; 11 : 30.) The prophetic utterances of Christ, Matt. 24 : 11–34, in words of marvel-

2 Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron;

2 seducing spirits and doctrines of demons, through
the hypocrisy of men that speak lies, [1] branded in
3 their own conscience as with a hot iron; forbidding

1 Or, *seared.*

ously graphic power, distinctly foretell such an event; while in some of the parables, as in that of the wheat and tares (Matt. 13) and in other passages, its dark shadow is plainly visible in the picture. It is natural, however, to think here of a direct communication of the Spirit to Paul; and this is made the more probable from the constant guidance of the Spirit which he enjoyed (Acts 16:6; 20:23), and from the fact that in an earlier epistle (2 Thess. 2) he has unfolded more fully the great apostasy of which he here sees the beginnings, and that so fully does the portentous image of this coming danger to the church loom up before him, that the thought of it pervades his epistles. (Col. 2:8, 16-23.) **That in the latter times**—rather, *in later times.* It is not spoken only of the last ages of the Christian Dispensation, but of *after times*, referring to the times following that in which the apostle is speaking. Evidently the beginnings of the apostasy are in the immediate future, as he warned the Ephesian elders in Acts 20:29, 30: "I know that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." The full and disastrous culmination of it, however, belongs to the closing period of the Christian Dispensation. "The expression 'times' (καίροι) or 'ages' (αἰῶνες) in Eph. 2:7 is itself proof that the apostles did not themselves conceive the coming of the end in their own time (καιρός). The prophecies fulfill themselves, not at once, nor once only, but repeatedly and gradually, in ascending series, up to the full end. Thus our heregiven prophecy of the falling away found already a fulfillment in the then apostolic age (or, καιρός), and consequently measures are already enjoined on Timothy against the impending destruction of the faith. But also in later epochs of the divine kingdom, this prophecy fulfills itself, until its culminating point . . . in the time (2 Thess. 2:3) immediately preceding the second appearing of the Lord." (Beck.) **Some shall depart from the faith**—that is, from the truths of the gospel, which are the objects of faith. Of this falling away other apostles also speak. (2 Peter 3:3; 1 John 2:18, 19.) **Giving heed to seducing spirits.** They departed from the faith through yielding to the seductive power of evil spirits, whose deceitful influences were exerted through false religious guides. (1 John 4:1, 6.) **And doctrines of devils**—or doctrines emanating from demons. The word here is not *devil* (διάβολος), but demons (δαιμόνια), a term which is never applied to Satan, or the devil, but in the New Testament ordinarily designates the fallen angels of whom Satan is the prince. (Matt. 9:34; 25:41.) Scripture connects them with the idolatry and oracles of the heathen, as inspiring the delusions and impieties of Paganism. (1 Cor. 10:12; James 3:15.) Perpetually seeking the ruin of men, they exhibit their most terrible physical power for evil in demoniacal possession, as Mark 5:1-9, and their most malignant influence over the soul in the errors and delusions they inspire, and the lusts and passions they inflame. These ministers of Satan rule in the life of the unregenerate world (Eph. 2:2); but they especially antagonize divine truth and grace in Christians (Eph. 6:11, 12), and are in direct, malignant opposition to the Holy Spirit—the Spirit of truth and holiness. (1 John 4:1-3, 6.) Indeed, such is human life that "a man never stands isolated; if the Divine Spirit do not lead him, the evil spirit will."

2. Speaking lies in hypocrisy—or, rather, *in the hypocrisy of men who speak lies*—that is, the seducing influences of the demons operate on men *in*, or *through*, hypocritical false teachers. The hypocrisy of these false guides was the sphere within which the malignant power of evil worked, and from which it issued, as a baleful, misleading influence, to delude and destroy souls. These teachers were not men of sincere, truth-loving souls, but were hypocritical; and their hypocrisy formed the point of contact between their souls and these demonic powers, and made them the medium of Satanic influence upon other souls. **Having their conscience seared with a hot iron**—or, *branded in their own conscience as with a hot iron.* (Revised Version.) The thought is not that their conscience has become

3 Forbidding to marry, *and commanding* to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth.
4 For every creature of God *is* good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving:

to marry, *and commanding* to abstain from meats, which God created to be received with thanksgiving
4 by them that believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing is to be

insensible, but that they stand self-convicted, consciously bearing the brand-marks of wrong doing. The ancients used a hot iron to brand the forehead of a criminal, so that thenceforth he might bear, always and everywhere, the brand-marks of his crime. Thus these men, while professing to be guides to righteousness, had their own conscience covered with the brand-marks of sin. Thus Robinson: "*Branded in their own consciences*; having the marks, *stigmata*, of their guilt burnt in upon their consciences, that is, being ever conscious of their guilt like branded criminals." Thus, also, Van Oosterzee, Alford, Ellicott, Wiesinger, Fausset, and Fairbairn.

3. Forbidding to marry—requiring abstinence from marriage, professedly as a means to higher sanctity. This was already a familiar conception among the Jews, from the ascetic principles of the Essenes and the Therapeutæ. It might, also, find support in a mistaken interpretation of our Lord's language, Matt. 19: 10-12; and also of Paul's, 1 Cor. 7: 8, 32-34. This tendency to depreciate marriage, although in fundamental opposition to Scripture (Gen. 2: 23, 24; 1 Cor. 9: 5; Heb. 13: 4), was already present in the Ephesian Church; and it afterward spread through all the churches, first in the Gnostic asceticism of the earlier Christian centuries, and then in the monasticism and the celibacy of the clergy in the Romish Church. The Council of Trent, in its tenth article on "marriage," says: "Whoever shall say that the married state is to be preferred to a state of virginity, or celibacy, and that it is not better and more blessed to remain in virginity, or celibacy, than to be joined in marriage; let him be accursed!" **Commanding to abstain from meats.** 'Commanding' is not expressed in the Greek, but is implied in the preceding participle. They forbade certain kinds of food, and perhaps all food at certain seasons. The tendency to discriminate in food may have had its root in the Jewish distinction between clean and unclean animals, a view made probable by Col. 2: 16, where the errorists are plainly Jews. This distinction between meats Christianity had abolished. (Acts 10: 15; Col. 2: 14-17; Rom. 14: 14, 20.) But the ascetism here described was, doubtless, also largely inspired by that Alexandrian and Asiatic philosophy, from which, when combined with Christianity, Gnosticism was at a later period developed, in one form of which, that of the Encratites, or Purists, marriage and animal food were forbidden. In the orthodox churches themselves, also, the tendency very early arose to regard celibacy as a superior spiritual condition, and abstinence from food as a special virtue. **Which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving.** In that God created food adapted for man, he thereby showed that it was intended for man; but only as it is received with a grateful recognition of God as its Author and Giver. **Of them which believe and know** (or, *acknowledge*) **the truth.** This defines those whom chiefly God had in view in creating food; it was his own people. The true end in the creation of food was to sustain and bless the spiritual as well as the bodily life; only those, therefore, who partake of food in faith, with adoring thanksgiving to God, receive its actual fullness of blessing, since in them alone is the purpose of its creation fulfilled. So far, therefore, from its being forbidden to them, it is for them only, in the highest sense, that it is intended. "As if those that wanted faith and saving knowledge, did but *usurp* the bread they eat. And, indeed, it is certain that the wicked have no right to the creatures of God in such ample sort as the godly have." (Sanderson.) "Properly speaking, God has appointed to his children alone the whole world and all that is in the world. For this reason, they are called the heirs of the world." (Calvin.)

4. For every creature of God is good—that is, everything created by God as food. It is in itself good, since it was made by him, and was pronounced by him at the creation "very good" (Gen. 1: 31); hence the prohibition of its use for the purpose intended by him is wrong and evil, and especially so in the case of those who eat with a thankful recognition of it as God's gift. **And nothing to be refused**—of the things of God made for food,

5 For it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer.

5 rejected, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified through the word of God and prayer.

"so that there is no sin in the use of them, nor any religion in the forbearing of them, or abstaining from them; this liberty was given us by God, and restored by Christ." (Burkitt.) **If it be received with thanksgiving.** See Romans 14 : 6. A thing in itself good may fail of its end, or even prove a curse, when received with an evil mind; and food only attains its true end when it awakens the thankfulness of a believing, adoring heart.

5. For it is sanctified—*hallowed*, "fit for the godly use of Christian men." (Alford.) **By the word of God**—that is, its use is warranted by the word of God. It is shown to be divinely intended for man, not only by the Creator's adaptation of it to him, but also by direct sanction of Scripture. See Gen. 1 : 29; 9 : 3, 4. Others, as Alford, Ellicott, Wiesinger, understand "the word of God" here as "Scripture language, used in the form of the blessing before meals, which thus hallowed the food." **And prayer**—that the food may be sanctified for use. The custom of asking a blessing before meals, in itself so suitable, is enforced by our Lord's example. (Mark 8 : 6; 14 : 22) It was evidently common among the primitive Christians. (Acts 27 : 35; Rom. 14 : 6; 1 Cor. 10 : 30; 14 : 16.) "It is a beastly way of eating, when we sit down at table without any prayer, and, when we have eaten to the full, depart in utter forgetfulness of God." (Calvin.) The beautiful formula of blessing given in the Apostolical Constitutions, VII. 49, illustrates the ancient practice: "Blessed be thou, O Lord, who hast fed me from my youth, who givest food to all flesh. Fill thou our hearts with joy and gladness, that, having always what sufficeth, we may abound unto all good works, in Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom be unto thee honor, glory, and power, forever and ever, Amen." The thought of the apostle, then, is: Food, having been formed by the Creator for man, and in Scripture expressly given him, should not be forbidden to man; and least of all to the Christian, who alone uses it according to its original purpose, and who thus alone finds in it the spiritual, as well as the material, good designed. He thus shows that asceticism is everywhere unnatural, but most of all in the Christian Church.

The general argument of the passage may be thus stated: God, when speaking in the two spheres of nature and religion, does not contradict himself. In the very constitution of the sexes, he has ordained marriage; and in the creation of food adapted to man's needs, he has appointed it for man's use. To these fundamental laws thus ordained in nature, he does not oppose other and contrary ones in religion. He does not contradict himself; nature and religion, therefore, as they both come from him, cannot, in their fundamental requirements, be opposed. Then the doctrine, as taught by these errorists, that the true and highest piety can be attained only by abstinence from marriage and food, must be essentially false, and all systems of asceticism, by the fact that they thus contravene great natural laws of God, are clearly proved as not from him. They are essentially false and evil, as, indeed, all history shows, in the fearful and wide-spread immorality to which they have always and inevitably tended.

It is evident, however, that this is not inconsistent with those passages in which fasting, and even abstinence from marriage, are encouraged; for these are plainly not rules intended for the ordinary conditions of life, but applicable only in special and exceptional circumstances. Thus fasting is presented, not as an habitual, but as an occasional duty, for special ends (Matt. 6 : 16, 17; 17 : 21; Mark 2 : 20; Acts 13 : 2, 3); and, in like manner, abstinence from marriage. (Matt. 19 : 12; 1 Cor. 7 : 8, 26, 27.) As in abnormal conditions of the body, the physician prescribes abstinence, so in abnormal conditions of the soul or of the Church, Scripture in like manner prescribes it; but in neither case could the prescription be made a rule in the normal conditions of life without evil result. "If temporary fasting should dispose and enable one to fight more successfully against the lusts of the flesh, or if by abstaining from marriage one could, in particular spheres of labor, or in certain conjunctures of the church's history more effectually serve the interests of the gospel than otherwise, then the higher principles of that gospel, the nobler ends of a Christian calling, will undoubtedly justify the restraint or the sacrifice. . . . . This is an entirely different thing from that morbid and mawkish asceticism, which, in attempting to soar above the

6 If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine, whereunto thou hast attained.
7 But refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise thyself *rather* unto godliness.
8 For bodily exercise profiteth little: but godliness is

6 If thou put the brethren in mind of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Christ Jesus, nourished in the words of the faith, and of the good
7 doctrine which thou hast followed *until now:* but
8 refuse profane and old wives' fables. And exercise thyself unto godliness: for bodily exercise is profit-

divinely appointed order and constitution of things, imputes a character of evil to what is in itself good, and hence withdraws men from those social environments which, as a rule, are necessary to the well-being of society, and to the full-orbed completeness of Christian character." (Fairbairn.)

6-10. TIMOTHY IS TO SHUN FOOLISH AND SUPERSTITIOUS FABLES, AND CULTIVATE PRACTICAL PIETY RATHER THAN BODILY AUSTERITIES.—1. In putting the church on their guard against this impending danger of defection from the faith, he will act the part of a good minister of Christ; but trifling and foolish fables he must shun, and discipline himself rather unto godliness, since ascetic, bodily discipline is profitable for little, while godliness is profitable for all things, seeing it has promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come. (6–8.) 2. This promise is sure, and is worthy of all acceptation; for it is in view of it the apostles and their fellow-laborers are enduring toil and conflict, their hope of its fulfillment being fixed on the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of those who believe. (9–10.)

6. If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things—or, *suggesting these things to the brethren.* He is to put them on their guard, and keep them on their guard, against this danger of defection from the faith, by instructing and warning them. **Thou shalt be a good minister of Christ Jesus**—*wilt be, will act as.* Such warning and instruction will show thee to be a good minister of Christ. **Nourished up in** (or, *nourishing thyself in;* or, *by means of*) **the words of faith** (or, *of the faith*)—that is, of the doctrines of the gospel. "Ever training thyself in the words of the faith." (Alford.) He had from childhood been carefully instructed in the truths of religion. (2 Tim. 1:5; 3:15.) He had been trained in the truths of the gospel by Paul himself. (2 Tim. 2:15.) The apostle would have him now himself continue this training, and by guarding the church against error, act as befits one thus instructed. **And of good doctrine** (or, *of the good instruction*) **whereunto thou hast attained** (rather, *which thou hast diligently followed;* or, *hast closely followed*). He had received good instruction, and, with thorough understanding of it, had thus far carefully followed it. The word here rendered *diligently followed* is translated in Luke 1:3, "having had perfect understanding," and 2 Tim. 3:10, "hast fully known."

7. But refuse profane and old wives' fables—*shun*, or, *excuse thyself from.* Have nothing to do with, avoid, the morally fruitless and silly fictions which are in circulation. These abounded in the heathen mythologies and in the Jewish traditions; and the tendency, it seems, was already present to connect such mythical legends with the Christian religion, especially as recommending asceticism by fables exalting its miraculous results. They were 'profane,' as derogatory to God and religion; they were 'old wives' fables,' in that they were senseless, silly, absurd—the mere croning of women who had reached the anility of second childhood. **And exercise thyself rather unto godliness.** As the athlete trains his body, so do thou, with strenuous effort, train thyself to true piety in heart and life. Instead of concerning thyself with such fables, seek personal holiness and the virtues of a life of practical godliness. See the imagery vividly depicted (1 Cor. 9:24-27), and the injunction reiterated with added force. (6:11, 12; 2 Tim. 2:22, 23; Heb. 5:14; 12:11.)

8. For bodily exercise—the practice of asceticism, in the mortification of the body, as in abstinence from marriage and food, in praise of which, doubtless, these fables were related. Thus Ambrose, Calvin, Grotius, Neander, Wiesinger, Barnes, and Ellicott. Others, however, understand it literally of athletic training in the gymnasium, here contrasted with spiritual training in practical godliness. The former seems to me to be preferred, as, on the whole, better suited to the general context, in which asceticism is the chief subject, and its undue exaltation is deprecated. **Profiteth**

profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.
9 This *is* a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation.
10 For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe.

able [1] for a little; but godliness is profitable for all things, having promise of the life which now is, and
9 of that which is to come. Faithful is the saying,
10 and worthy of all acceptation. For to this end we labour and strive, because we have our hope set on the living God, who is the Saviour of all men,

1 Or, *for little.*

little—or, *is profitable for little*, is of little or limited value; *for little* stands in contrast with 'unto all things,' below. Fasting and the denial of bodily gratification have a proper place and value; for there are occasions when Christians ought to fast and mortify the body (Matt. 4:2; 6:17; 9:15; 17:21; Acts 13:2,3; 14:23; 1 Cor. 7:5); but these occasions are exceptional, and the value of such austerities is small, affecting the well being only within a narrow limit. Possibly the exhortation here, as also in 5:23, may suggest that Timothy himself had tendencies to asceticism which the apostle deemed excessive. **But godliness**—piety springing from faith, practical religion in heart and life—**is profitable unto all things**—for the entire well-being, bodily and spiritual, temporal and eternal. It tends to the welfare of soul as well as body, of the whole being in every possible relation and condition, for eternity as well as time. **Having** (or, *seeing it has*) **promise of the life that now is**—the present life on earth. Religion alone secures a true well-being in this life and obtains life's real good, since it places the man in right relations to God and the world, and fits him for the true enjoyment of all earthly good. Hence the richest promises of earthly blessing are made to Christians. See Deut. 4:40; 5:33; 1 Kings 3:7–13; Psalms 23:37; 84:11; 112; Isa. 33:16; 46:4; Matt. 6:33; Mark 10:29, 30; Rom. 8:28; 1 Cor. 3:21, 22; Eph. 6:2, 3; Phil. 4:19. They alone extract the real good of the present life; and to them all needful blessings are assured throughout its manifold phases of youth and age, health and sickness, joy and sorrow, honor and dishonor, life and death. **And of that which is to come.** It insures the highest well-being, the richest good, of all the future, eternal life. Godliness has the promise of both worlds, assuring the highest welfare, bodily and mental, moral and spiritual. (John 3:16; 14:2,3; Rev. 2:10.) Others, however, limit the promise to spiritual, eternal life, which already exists in the soul (John 5:24), and regard it as assuring to the believer the richest experiences of that life here and hereafter. "It is the salvation-life, embracing time and eternity, with the enjoyment of divine grace in its spiritual forces and blessings." (Beck.)

9. This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation—referring to the promise attached to godliness. (1:15.) That promise of life in its highest well-being, here and hereafter, is sure, and is worthy of all acceptation.

10. For therefore—that is, *in view of, inspired by*, this promise—**we both labour and suffer reproach**—or, *we toil and strive.* As a confirmation of the certainty of this promise, he shows that it is in view of this the apostles and their fellow-workers are toiling and striving. They were enduring the labors and conflicts they met, trusting in the certain fulfillment of this great promise. *Strive* is the reading in most of the best manuscripts, as the Sinaitic, Alexandrian, and Ephraim; many of the expositors, however, decide for 'suffer reproach,' the reading of the Common Version. **Because we trust in** (*have fixed our hope on*) **the living God**—or, *on God as the living God.* This is the ground of their confidence respecting the fulfillment of the promise; their hope is not fixed on the dead idols of heathenism, but on the true and living God, who is himself life and the Fountain of life, and who is, therefore, able to fulfill his word. "It was because they had hoped upon the living God they could so confidently reckon on an endless heritage of peaceful and blessed life, and so willingly submit to all the privations and toils that might meet them in pursuit of it; for he who is himself the Living One, having the very fountain of life in perpetual freshness and inexhaustible sufficiency, is, in this case, the surety and promise." (Fairbairn.) **Who is the Saviour of all men.** God is the Saviour of all men: 1. As the Creator, Preserver, and Benefactor of all men. (Job. 7:20; Matt. 5:45; Acts 17:24-28.) He preserves and blesses the lives of all men in his beneficent, providential administration. 2. As the Author

11 These things command and teach.
12 Let no man despise thy youth; but be thou an example of the believers in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity.

11 specially of them that believe. These things com-
12 mand and teach. Let no man despise thy youth; but be thou an ensample to them that believe, in word, in manner of life, in love, in faith, in purity.

of salvation for all men, a salvation ample for all and offered to all. (2:4-6; Mark 16:15, 16; John 3:16; 2 Peter 3:9.) Here the emphasis is on the first of these senses: God is the Preserver and Benefactor of all men. **Specially of those that believe.** While he is the Saviour of all, he is the Saviour, in an especial sense, of believers as his redeemed people. This may refer: 1. To that temporal salvation which the God-man, now exalted on the throne of the universe as Head over all things for his church, secures for his redeemed people, causing all things to work together for their good (Rom. 8:28), and employing "all power in heaven and in earth" to defend and support and bless them even in this earthly life. There is a special providence exercised over every believing soul by virtue of its relation to Christ. (2 Kings 6:16, 17; Ps. 34:7, 10; Luke 12:7; Acts 18:9, 10; 26:17; 2 Tim. 4:17, 18.) Or 2. To that eternal salvation which, in the amplitude of its provision, is provided for all and offered to all, but which, by God's special grace, is made effectual for believers in the actual deliverance from wrath and sin, and the attainment of everlasting life. "God is the Saviour of all men in *will;* and he is the Saviour of all who believe, not only in will, but also in *effect.*" (Wordsworth.) Of believers, Christ said: "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish." (John 10:28.) Alford well expresses the general force of the reasoning: "If God be thus willing for all to be saved, how much more shall he save them that put their trust in him?"

11-16. Admonitions to Personal Holiness and Ministerial Fidelity.—1. These things Timothy is to teach and enjoin; but while so doing, he is to show in himself a maturity of understanding and an example of Christian character and life, such that none shall find occasion to despise his youth. (11, 12.) 2. During the absence of the apostle he is to conduct the public services of the Christian assembly, and in this work make full use of the gift received through prophetic revelation and recognized as in him at his ordination. (13, 14.) 3. He is to be wholly absorbed in his work, so that his growth in qualification for it may be apparent to all; and he is assured that, in such faithful performance of the duties of his office, he will promote alike his own salvation and the salvation of those who hear him. (15, 16.)

11. These things command and teach—the things just mentioned concerning ascetic austerities and the supreme value of godliness, as having promise of the life now and hereafter.

12. Let no man despise thy youth—give no one occasion to despise thee on account of thy youth. "Let the gravity of thy life supply the want of years." (Chrysostom.) If Timothy was twenty years old when Paul took him as an assistant at Lystra, A. D. 51, he was now, A. D. 66, about thirty-five or six, a very young man compared with Paul, whose apostolic authority he was temporarily representing in the important church at Ephesus, and especially as compared with the presbyters and other officers, who had doubtless been chosen, as was usual, from the more aged members, but whom he was called to instruct, and probably in some instances to rebuke. (5:1.) Possibly his comparative youth had elsewhere tended to his disparagement, and it was the more important that, in his present responsible post, he give no occasion for it in his public work and conduct. (1 Cor. 16:11.) **But be thou an example of the believers**—or, *prove thyself a pattern, a model.* The danger arising from his comparative youth, he is to avert by presenting in himself a model of sound understanding and Christian character, such as would command respect for him notwithstanding his youth. This is a first duty in the minister; in understanding, character, and life he is to be a safe model for his people. On this will depend the strength of his pastoral authority, and the weight of his pulpit instruction. Compare Titus 2:7, 8; Phil. 3:17; 2 Thess. 3:9; 1 Peter 5:3. **In word**—in discourse, whether public or private; careful in speech. **In conversation**—or, *conduct;* in deportment, behavior, course of life. **In charity**—or, *love*; love to God, to the brethren, and to all men; his life is to be inspired by, and insphered in, love. **In faith**—firm confidence in, and ad-

13 Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.
14 Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was

13 Till I come, give heed to reading, to exhortation,
14 to teaching. Neglect not the gift that is in thee,

herence to, God and his word, shown in his teaching, his spirit, and his life. In the first couplet, *in word and conduct*, the apostle has set forth the exterior life; in the second, *in love and faith*, the interior life, as these are the regnant, inward, impulsive forces in true living. **In purity**—in holiness, moral purity. "Simplicity of holy motive followed out in consistency of holy action." (Alford.) The word doubtless includes chastity, purity of heart and conduct in relation to the other sex, but it is of wider scope, denoting moral purity in all the affections and relations; and here it signifies the spiritual atmosphere in which the whole life moves, singleness of moral purpose, elevation of moral thinking and feeling. As the minister's position is necessarily conspicuous, he is to be a shining example, a transparent, pure man, illustrating in himself the excellence and power of religion. The words 'in spirit,' inserted in the Common Version, are not found in the best MSS., and are now rejected as not genuine by all authorities.

13. Till I come. Timothy, then, was not "bishop of Ephesus," but was only filling temporarily the apostle's place there in the general supervision, till Paul himself should return. (1 : 3; 3 : 14.) No hint is given in Scripture that he filled any permanent office in that or any other city; but the reverse is clearly implied. The work he was performing there is expressly called that of an evangelist, and soon after he is summoned by Paul to Rome. (2 Tim. 4 : 5, 9.) He nowhere appears in any other character than as an evangelist, assisting the apostle in his itinerant work. That he was ever bishop of Ephesus has no support in Scripture, and rests only on a very weak tradition. **Give attendance to** (*the*) **reading**—that is, as the article in the Greek indicates, the public reading of the Scriptures in the Christian assembly. This had always formed an important part of synagogue worship (Luke 4 : 16, 17; Acts 13 : 15), and it was from the first adopted as a part of the public service in Christian churches. It is probable that already some of the New Testament writings had a place among the Scriptures thus read. See Col. 4 : 16; 1 Thess. 5 : 21, 27; 2 Peter 3 : 15, 16; Rev. 1 : 3. At the date of this Epistle, A. D. 66, First and Second Thessalonians had been written thirteen years; Galatians, ten; First and Second Corinthians, nine; Romans, eight; Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians, Philemon, and Hebrews, three; while the Synoptic Gospels and the Acts, with the Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude, were probably already widely copied and circulated. Copies of most of these would very early find their way to so great a centre as Ephesus, and would there meet a reverent reception, as the utterances of inspired men. **To** (*the*) **exhortation**—referring to that form of public address which is specially intended to excite the feelings and impel to action. **To** (*the*) **doctrine**—the public instruction, in which the purpose is to enlighten the understanding by reasoning, either in unfolding and establishing truth, or in exposing and refuting error. Both exhortation and teaching are mentioned as *charisms* in ordinary exercise in the church. (Rom. 12 : 7, 8.) Evidently the Scriptures read, as furnishing the true incentives to Christian action and the materials of Christian knowledge, formed the basis of exhortation to duty and of instruction in truth; and the three words, 'reading,' 'exhortation.' 'doctrine' or *teaching*, designated the chief parts of the public service with which Timothy was concerned.

14. Neglect not the gift that is in thee—"do not leave unexercised the gift," but use it in thy public work in the church, in the reading, the exhortation, the teaching. *Gift* (χάρισμα) is used seventeen times in the New Testament, and has the following senses: 1. Divine grace in salvation. (Rom. 5 : 15, 16; 6 : 23; 11 : 29.) 2. Divine grace in deliverance from peril. (2 Cor. 1 : 11.) 3. Intellectual and spiritual gifts, sometimes natural and ordinary (Rom. 1 : 11; 1 Cor. 7 : 7; 1 Peter 4 : 10), sometimes extraordinary, either natural gifts specially enlarged and exalted by the Spirit, or wholly supernatural, as the gift of miracles. (1 Cor. 1 : 7; 12 : 4, 9, 28, 30, 31.) 4. The gift for the ministry. (2 Tim. 1 : 6.) Here the obvious reference, required by the context, is to the gift possessed by Timothy for his public work, as connected with the reading, the exhortation, the teaching, wherein he is exhorted to employ his gift. There is no hint that this gift was other than

given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.
15 Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear to all.

which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. 15 Be diligent in these things; give thyself wholly to them; 16 that thy progress may be manifest unto all. Take

natural, such as "the brethren at Lystra and Iconium" had already perceived in him, when they commended him to Paul as a fitting assistant in his missionary work (Acts 16:1-3); although it is not improbable that, by the imposition of the apostle's hands at his ordination, this gift was enlarged and exalted by the special influences of the Holy Spirit then received. This gift, or *charism*, for the evangelist's work is compared (2 Tim. 1:6) to a holy spark, or flame, kindled on the soul by the Holy Spirit, which, like the flame on the ancient altar, must never go out, but be kept ever burning by constant use; "stir up," *rekindle* "the gift of God." That this was some invisible gift, or secret virtue, trickling from the apostolic fingers, to be transmitted in like manner through the ages by successive episcopal ordinations, as something essential to a valid ministry, is a grotesque assumption, belonging to the realm rather of fable than of fact, and so utterly without basis in Scripture, here or elsewhere, as to find no place in sober exegesis. **Which was given thee by prophecy**—referring to some prophecy, uttered by the Holy Spirit, perhaps through prophets at Lystra and Iconium (1:18; Acts 3:1-3; 16:2), designating Timothy to the work of the ministry and predicting his distinguished success in it. Probably this designation by the Spirit led to his ordination, and the gift, which had already been discerned in him, was on that occasion enlarged and exalted into a *charism*, or spiritual gift, by the Holy Spirit, imparted through the laying on of an apostle's hands. "He had not only been chosen by the judgment of men, in the ordinary way, but had been previously named by the Spirit." (Calvin.) **With the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.** The gift was imparted *in connection with* the imposition of the hands of the elders of the church where he was ordained, probably at Lystra; but as a *charism*, it was the direct result of the imposition of Paul's hands, who doubtless united with the presbyters in the act, and through whom, as an apostle, the Holy Spirit was given, illumining and elevating the natural gift before existing, and making a spiritual gift for the work of an evangelist. The doctrine "of the laying on of hands" is named among the rudimentary teachings of the Christian religion. (Heb. 6:1, 2.) As a form, it is used: 1. To confer or invoke a blessing on another. (Gen. 48:14; Matt. 19:15.) 2. To signify the laying of sin on the victim, or on the scapegoat, in the ancient sacrifices. (Lev. 8:14.) 3. To impart healing power. (Mark 6:5; Luke 4:40; 13:13; Acts 28:8.) 4. By apostles, in the exercise of their special prerogative, to confer the Holy Spirit. (Acts 8:17, 18; 2 Tim. 1:6.) 5. To consecrate to a sacred office, or special religious work. (Num. 8:10, 11; 27:23; Acts 6:6; 13:3; 1 Tim. 5:22.) Here the reference is to consecration to office, which, according to an apparently uniform custom in the apostolic churches, was done by the imposition of the hands of the ministry, connected with prayer. The word 'presbytery' is used in the New Testament as referring: 1. To the Jewish Sanhedrin. (Luke 22:6; Acts 22:5.) 2. To the body of elders which presided over a Christian congregation, but is only here found as a direct designation of them. (Acts 14:23; 20:17; James 5:14.)

15. Meditate upon (*be mindful of*, or, *care for, be concerned for*) **these things**—that is, the things commanded above, especially those in which his ministerial gift should be used. It directly enjoins, not so much reflection, or thought, on them, as care for them, interest in them. **Give thyself wholly to them**—literally, *be in them*. Have thy whole being in them; be entirely absorbed, engrossed, in them. He must not be diverted from his work to other interests, however excellent they may be, whether science, literature, art, society, politics, or earthly business. His whole being, in every faculty of body and soul, is to be given, without reserve and with hearty enthusiasm, to the work of the ministry. This is his solemn duty, and it is the essential condition of genuine success. **That thy profiting** (*progress*) **may appear to all**—thy growth in qualification; thy advancement in knowledge, wisdom, holiness, and ministerial power. "Implying, first, that a perceptible advance in the things which constitute a faithful and effective ministry is what may be justly expected even in the most quali-

16 Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee.

heed to thyself, and to thy teaching. Continue in these things; for in doing this thou shalt save both thyself and them that hear thee.

CHAPTER V.

REBUKE not an elder, but entreat *him* as a father; *and* the younger men as brethren;
2 The elder women as mothers; the younger as sisters, with all purity.

1 Rebuke not an elder, but exhort him as a father: 2 the younger men as brethren: the elder women as mothers; the younger as sisters, in all purity.

fied servant of God; and then that the way to effect this is by a sincere and devoted application to the work itself." (Fairbairn.) 'Profiting' (*progress*). Compare for the use of the word, Phil. 1 : 12, 25.

16. Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine. The first care of the minister should be for his personal character and life, that he may be in these an example to the flock; for without a pure life all else is worthless. (6:11; 2 Tim. 2:22.) Next, he is to look well to his teaching, alike as to its truth, that it be the pure word of God, and as to its adaptation and power, that his discourse be seasonable, and in manner and force worthy of the great themes he handles. (2 Tim. 2:15.) **Continue in them**—steadfastly pursue thy work. Let nothing turn thee aside from it. (Acts 20:24.) **For in doing this**—not *by* doing this, as if this would be the procuring cause of salvation, but *in* doing this. We are not saved *by* our duties, but *in* them, as the sphere within which, and the means through which, the grace of God saves us. **Thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee.** The ministry, faithfully exercised, furnishes the most favorable conditions for salvation, in purifying, enlarging, and ennobling the soul, and preparing it for glory. (Ezek. 33:9; James 5:20.) "In striving to save others, the minister is really caring for his own salvation." (Wiesinger.) Fidelity, also, promotes the salvation of his hearers; souls are thereby won to Christ. The richest promises of success here and of glory hereafter are given to the faithful minister. (Dan. 12:3; Mark 1:17; John 4:36; Acts 11:24; 14:1; 2 Tim. 4:7.) "As the unfaithfulness or carelessness of the pastor is ruinous to the church, so the cause of salvation is justly ascribed to his faithfulness and diligence. True, it is God alone that saves; and not even the smallest portion of his glory can be lawfully bestowed on men. But God parts with no portion of his glory when he employs the agency of men for bestowing salvation." (Calvin.) "Few are the devoted ministers of Christ who are not permitted to see evidence even here that their labor has not been in vain. Let not, then, the faithful preacher be discouraged. A single soul rescued from death will be a gem in his eternal crown brighter by far than ever sparkled on the brow of royalty." (Barnes.)

Ch. 5:1, 2. SPIRIT AND MANNER OF ADMINISTERING REPROOF.—He is enjoined to use entreaty rather than harsh rebuke, exercising toward the aged due reverence, and toward all genuine tenderness of heart, with purity in motive and act.

1. Rebuke—literally, *strike*, or *smite*, then applied to sharp, or harsh reproof. **Not an elder**—*an aged man.* 'Elder' here is evidently not used as the official title of presbyter, since it stands contrasted with "the younger men," mentioned immediately after. The minister, while faithful in the rebuke of sin, is to observe the natural proprieties of life. Respect for age is a dictate of nature, as well as an express command of Scripture. "Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and honour the face of the old man, and fear thy God; I am the Lord." (Deut. 19:32; 1 Peter 5:5.) This reverence for age, often conspicuously absent in the Western world, ever has been one of the common and beautiful traits in Oriental life. While the duty of all, it should be specially prominent in the young minister, not only toward the honored and good, but also toward those whose misconduct requires admonition. **But exhort him as a father.** He is not to denounce with harsh reprimand, but to exhort, or entreat, as one would entreat an erring father. **The younger men as brethren**—not harshly, arrogantly, but with the sympathy and affection one would use in seeking to reclaim a brother.

2. The elder women as mothers. Deal with them, not severely and sternly, but as a man would deal with his mother, in leading

her out of error and sin into truth and holiness. **The younger as sisters, with all purity.** Purity here, as 4:12, has the broader sense of moral purity in general, but, in this connection, undoubtedly, emphasizes chastity in spirit, manner, and act. Even in his admonition of the other sex, he is to maintain perfect purity, so guarding the sacredness of his character, that the heart be preserved incorrupt, and that neither by tone, or look, or word, or act, the shadow of suspicion shall rest on his intentions and conduct. "The 'all' here implies, with every caution, so as not to give the slightest suspicion." (Bloomfield.)

3-16. Duty of the Church in Regard to the Care of Widows.—From the first, widows were recipients of the special care and bounty of the church. (Acts 6:1.) It is obvious, however, that, as Christianity extended, definite regulations would be needed to prevent the abuse of this beneficent provision, and define the limits within which it was to be applied. Church charity might otherwise only foster idleness and pauperism, with all their attendant evils, and might prove, as public charities have sometimes proved, a curse rather than a blessing. The apostle therefore states four prerequisites for admission into the number of widows supported by the church. It is required of the applicant: 1. That she be in actual need, without relatives to support her. 2. That she has reached sixty years of age. 3. That she has sustained irreproachable marital relations. 4. That she has made a good reputation for home virtues and works of benevolence. The reasons assigned for these limitations are: (*a*) As to her desolation; that, when there are children, or grandchildren, these ought to show filial piety by giving her the needed support, so that the church, thus exempted from the care of such, may be able to relieve those wholly without kindred. (*b*) As to the age required; that the younger widows, by receiving church support, would be likely to fall into idleness and gossip, and, in the desire for remarriage, would yield to a wanton, sensual disposition, such as could only be cherished in a heart lost to the simplicity and purity of its first faith in Christ, and thus resting under condemnation.

Most modern interpreters, as Huther, Hofmann, Van Oosterzee, Wiesinger, Alford, and Ellicott, suppose that here, at least in verses 9, and 10, the widows referred to formed a body either of female presbyters, or of deaconesses. The verb, to *enroll, to put on a list*, or *register* (καταλέγειν), they interpret of enrollment on a list of church officers. It seems, however, far more natural to understand it of enrollment on the list of widows supported by the church, especially as the support of widows is plainly the general subject of the whole passage. That these widows cannot have filled any active official position seems plain from the following considerations: 1. They must be at least sixty years old, an age which ordinarily precludes active duties, such as devolved on the deaconesses, and the later order of female presbyters; and this would be especially the case in the East, where woman, as a general fact, decays much earlier than in the West. 2. No duties whatever are assigned them in this passage, or even intimated as performed by them. The only description of their life is that, being without kindred and without family cares, they waited continually on God in "supplications and prayers." The passage therefore contains no evidence of the official position of the widows, but implies the reverse. That being supported by the church and wholly without household cares, they performed much useful service in their personal influence and their labors in the church is indeed probable; and that, out of this body of widows supported by the church was derived, at a later period, the order of female presbyters, of whom Tertullian apparently speaks, is in itself not unlikely; but neither in this passage, nor in any other in the New Testament, is there the slightest hint of an official order of widows. This idea is imported into the passage from a much later usage found in the patristic churches; a method of interpretation which involves, not merely an anachronism, but also a false principle by which other patristic additions to Christianity are foisted upon Scripture. There is no credible witness to such an order of female presbyters before Tertullian, more than a century after the death of the last apostle. Thus nearly all the ancient commentators, with Whitby, Neander, Fairbairn, and others among the modern.

I. **3-8.** Duty of the Church to Make Provision for Widows who are in Actual Desolation and Need.—1. Widows who are without kindred and in need, are to

3 Honour widows that are widows indeed.
4 But if any widow have children or nephews, let them learn first to shew piety at home, and to requite their parents: for that is good and acceptable before God.
5 Now she that is a widow indeed, and desolate, trusteth in God, and continueth in supplications and prayers night and day.

3 Honour widows who are widows indeed. But if any
4 widow hath children or grandchildren, let them learn first to shew piety towards their own family, and to requite their parents: for this is acceptable
5 in the sight of God. Now she that is a widow indeed, and desolate, hath her hope set on God, and continueth in supplications and prayers night and

be relieved by the church; but widows who have children or grandchildren, should be supported by them, as a duty required by filial gratitude and acceptable to God. (3, 4.) 2. The reason for this restriction in church support: The widow who is thus left desolate, being without earthly dependence and care, has her hope fixed on God, and devotes herself continually to supplication and worship; while the widow who, being not thus in actual need, lives luxuriously, is, as to the true end of life, dead while she lives. (5, 6.) 3. These commands respecting widows Timothy is to enjoin, that the church may not be subject to reproach; but if any person neglects to make provision for those belonging to his own household, he shows himself false to the gospel and inferior even to the heathen. (7, 8.)

3. Honour widows that are widows indeed—that is, who are truly *widowed, bereaved, desolate*, which indeed is, in the original, the import of the word *widow;* one who is in actual desolation and destitution, and is thus dependent on church support. 'Honor' by placing them among the number deemed worthy to be supported by the church. The word contains the idea not only of respect, consideration, but also in such a connection as this, that of temporal support. (Ver. 17; Matt. 15:4-6; Acts 28:10.) It suggests that such relief is not to be dealt out to them as to mere paupers, in a manner to degrade them, but as to Christian women whom the church holds in honor, and to whom it thus shows honor. Care for widows was a marked feature in the Old Testament period (Exod. 22:22-24; Deut. 24:17-19); and in the apostolic churches it was very early made a prominent duty (Acts 6:1). It is one of the most natural and beautiful forms of Christian beneficence.

4. But if any widow hath children or nephews (or, *grandchildren*). It is implied that they are of fitting age and circumstances to relieve her need. **Let them learn**—that is, the children or grandchildren. Many of the older interpreters, and some of the later, refer this to the widows as enjoining them not to forsake their children or grandchildren, but to rear them piously, and thus requite the pious care which they (the widows) themselves received from their own parents. But this view seems excluded by the following considerations: 1. Such an exhortation would be wholly needless; the natural mother-love would keep them from abandoning their children. 2. The widow here is evidently contrasted with the widow in verse 3, as one who, having relatives, is not "desolate," and is not to be supported by the church. 3. Not only does the plural form, 'let them learn,' suggest a reference to the children, but the whole subsequent context favors this reference—as, for example, the words "show piety" and "requite their parents" can only be applied to the widows by a very forced and unnatural process. **First to show piety at home** (*toward their own house*) **and to requite their parents.** The children or grandchildren are to show their filial piety by providing for the widowed mother or grandmother, and thus requite her care for them. **For that is good and acceptable before God**—because in so doing they are pleasing to God. (Eph. 6:2,3.) The duty of support rests on them *first*, before it comes on the church. The Pharisaic tradition justified the child in devoting his means on God's altar, though he thereby left his parents in want; but Jesus rebuked it as a transgression of the divine law. (Matt. 15:1-9; Eph. 6:1,2.) The words 'good and,' placed in the Common Version before 'acceptable,' are wanting in all old manuscripts, and are rejected by critical editors.

5. Now—resuming the description of the true widow which was broken off by verse 4. **She that is a widow indeed and desolate**—one who has no kindred on whom she can depend and is thus left in desolation. **Trusteth in God**—or, *Has fixed her hope on God;* her desolate condition, without earthly supporters, impels her to set, and continue to keep, her hope on God. (Jer. 49:11.) "It is the duty and comfort of those who are desolate. *Therefore* God sometimes brings his people into such straits that they have nothing else to trust to,

6 But she that liveth in pleasure is dead while she
liveth.
7 And these things give in charge, that they may be
blameless.
8 But if any provide not for his own, and specially
for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith,
and is worse than an infidel.
9 Let not a widow be taken into the number under
threescore years old, having been the wife of one man,

6 day. But she that giveth herself to pleasure is dead
7 while she liveth. These things also command, that
8 they may be without reproach. But if any provid-
eth not for his own, and specially his own house-
hold, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an
9 unbeliever. Let none be enrolled as a widow under

that they may with more confidence trust in him." (Henry.) **And continueth in supplications and prayers night and day.** The Greek words have the article, *the supplications and the prayers*, and the reference may be to stated attendance on the public prayers of the church, for which her freedom from domestic cares would give opportunity, and to which her desolation might naturally prompt. 'Night and day,' however, suggests rather the translation, *her supplications and her prayers*, the article designating these as the natural and well-known duties of Christians, to which she in a special manner would give herself. Of the two words, the former signifies *petitions*, the latter *acts of worship;* here, probably, there is no emphasis on the distinction. Possibly the case of Anna was before the apostle's mind. (Luke 2 : 36, 37; 18 : 7; 1 Cor. 7 : 32.)

6. But—in contrast with the case of the true widow. **She that liveth in pleasure**—*lives in luxury, voluptuously, wantonly* (James 5 : 5); one who lives indulging the bodily appetites and the mere pleasures of sense. Ellicott thinks the word also "points to prodigality, wastefulness." **Is dead while she lives**—her frivolous, selfish, sensual existence is not true life; it fulfills none of life's true ends, and, as to any real value to herself or to others, she is practically dead. (Matt. 8 : 22; Eph. 5 : 14; Rev. 3 : 1.) "Though she seems to live this life of the senses, she is dead according to the Spirit." (Theophylact.) "While alive in the flesh, she has no real life in the Spirit." (Alford.)

7. And these things give in charge—the things concerning widows, ver. 3-6. **That they may be blameless.** The end had in view, namely—that the church be not exposed to reproach, as they would be, either by improper conduct in the widows themselves, or by unnatural neglect of widows on the part of those bound to care for them.

8. But if any provide not for his own. A general precept, requiring all to make provision for those naturally dependent on them, but here given as emphasizing the duty of children to provide for a widowed mother, or grandmother. The word 'provide' signifies *to take care for beforehand*, to foresee and prepare for coming need. (Rom. 12 : 17; 2 Cor. 8 : 21.) **And specially for those of his own house**—his own kindred, those naturally dependent on him, as rightful members of his family. This, though it certainly suggests provision for one's family (2 Cor. 12 : 14), does not authorize the hoarding of wealth for them, a sin for which this passage is often cited in justification. But here the emphasis is not placed on the duty of parents to provide for the future wealth of their children, but on the duty of children to provide for the present needs of their parents. Against such hoarding for children Scripture gives frequent and solemn warning. (Ps. 39 : 6; Eccl. 2 : 18, 19, Luke 12 : 20.) **He hath denied the faith**—has repudiated the gospel as a rule of life, in that, by failing to provide for those dependent on him, he is untrue to its teachings and spirit, and has thus practically renounced the faith. "Where love does not exist nor work, there neither does faith exist nor work; so that he who does not fulfill the offices of love toward his kindred, is virtually an unbeliever." (Macknight.) **And is worse than an infidel** (*unbeliever*). Shows himself inferior in this virtue even to the heathen. Cicero taught: "Every man ought to take care of his own family"; and this was the common doctrine of the heathen moralists. Christ teaches that the Christian should be in every virtue superior to the heathen. (Matt. 5 : 46, 47.)

II. 9, 10. Qualifications Required in Widows Supported by the Church.—They must (1) have attained sixty years of age; (2) have sustained honorable marital relations; (3) have made a good reputation for the domestic virtues and for works of benevolence.

9. Let not a widow be taken into the number (*enrolled*) **under threescore years old.** This did not preclude aid to widows who were younger and were in need; but it was to

10 Well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work.

threescore years old, *having been* the wife of one man,
10 well reported of for good works; if she hath brought up children, if she hath used hospitality to strangers, if she hath washed the saints' feet, if she hath relieved the afflicted, if she hath diligently followed

be presumed that, as a rule, those under sixty would be capable of self-support, or would need only occasional aid. Hence the rule that only such as had reached the age of sixty should be placed among those whose full support the church assumed. **Having been the wife of one man**—that is, one who had lived chastely in the marriage relation. It has no reference to the number of times she had been married, but refers solely to fidelity to the marriage vow. Only women who had led virtuous lives were to be received. That the apostle does not intend to place a stigma on remarriage, and make it a bar to reception into the number of widows supported by the church, is evident from the following considerations: 1. He expressly directs, in verse 14, that the younger widows remarry, and affirms, in Rom. 7 : 1-3; 1 Cor. 7 : 8, 9, 39, the rightfulness of remarriage. 2. There is no adequate evidence of a public sentiment against remarriage in the apostolic age; this feeling arose at a later period, as a natural outgrowth of the false asceticism, whose beginnings the apostle deprecates in this Epistle. 3. Even were it shown that such a sentiment existed at that time, it is wholly unlikely that the apostle would foster it, even by a temporary concession; for such a feeling is in its nature wholly false, and is subversive of a fundamental human right. 4. The language here does not require the reference to remarriage after death of a husband; for, in the frequency of divorce, and the general laxity of morals (a laxity inconceivable in our Christian civilization), it was not an unusual fact that several living men had stood in the relation of husband to the same woman, or that the woman, before her conversion, had been notoriously unfaithful to the marriage vow. The language here would perfectly apply to either of these cases. (Matt. 14 : 3, 4; 1 Cor. 5 : 1.) Such a view is utterly foreign to the spirit and doctrine of Paul, who specially warns Timothy against such an ascetic tendency (4 : 3), and declares that "marriage is honourable in all." (Heb. 13 : 14.) Compare, for more full discussion, notes on ch. 3 : 2. The widow therefore whose former marriage relations had been discreditable was not to be received to bring discredit on those supported by the church.

10. Well reported of for good works—that is, for good works done in her former married life. She must have a good reputation as one who had worthily performed the duties of life. The 'good works' here are not mentioned as duties for which she must be qualified, as if they belonged to an office to which she was now to be set apart; for of this there is no intimation. But they are good works which in her married life she faithfully performed, and which therefore show her to be worthy of this provision for her destitute and widowed old age. Hence he names the prominent virtues of a Christian matron, the head of a household; and if in her married and prosperous days these virtues have been shown in her, this was to be received as evidence of her worthiness to be enrolled among the widows. Examples of the good works referred to are now specifically cited. **If she have brought up children**—well, successfully brought them up, her own or others'. **If she have lodged strangers**—was hospitable to strangers, a duty constantly insisted on in the New Testament. (3 : 2; Rom. 12 : 13; Heb. 13 : 2.) **If she have washed the saints' feet.** If her home had been freely open to Christians, who in that age specially needed hospitality, and her heart had prompted her to perform for them, as Christ's servants, the most humble services, such even as the hospitable duty of washing their feet. In hot countries, where only sandals are worn, this is necessary to hospitality, but it is usually done by servants. (Gen. 18 : 4; 19 : 2; Luke 7 : 44; John 13 : 14.) **If she have relieved the afflicted**—was thoughtful and helpful to the poor, the sick, the sorrowing, and the friendless. **If she have diligently followed every good work**—if her life was marked by kindness, benevolence, and by interest and effort for truth and righteousness. The apostle here depicts, with marvelous skill, the traits of a true Christian matron, and enjoins that only such as have shown them shall be admitted to the privileged position of widows supported by the church. This beneficent provision thus

11 But the younger widows refuse: for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry;
12 Having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith.

11 every good work. But younger widows refuse: for when they have waxed wanton against Christ, they
12 desire to marry; having condemnation, because

served to deter from a vicious and selfish life, by being restricted to those who had been virtuous and benevolent; and the history of church charities abundantly justifies the wisdom of such a restriction. "Particular care ought to be taken to relieve those, when they fall into decay, who, when they had wherewithal, were ready to every good work." (Henry.)

III. **11-16.** Widows under Sixty Years of Age are not to be Enrolled among those Sustained by the Church.—1. Reasons for excluding such from the list: (*a*) Their liability to fall under the influence of wanton desire, seeking remarriage, and thus to come under condemnation, by indulging a frivolous, earthly, sensual disposition, inconsistent with their original faith in Christ. (*b*) Their danger, if thus relieved by the church of the necessity of self-support, of becoming idle gossipers and tattlers, and in this way injurious to themselves and others. (11-13.) 2. It is the apostle's will, therefore, that the younger widows marry, and assume the duties belonging to heads of families; and the recommendation to this finds emphasis in the fact, that some younger widows, who had been placed on the widow's list, had already become an occasion of scandal, having yielded to temptation. (14, 15.) 3. If, however, they do not remarry, their Christian relations or friends, should they have such, ought to assume their support; that the church be not burdened, but have means to support those whose age and desolation make them widows indeed. (16.)

11. But the younger widows refuse—decline to put widows less than sixty years old on the list of those supported by the church. **For when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ**—*waxed wanton;* "incited by sensual desire." (Grimm.) 'Against Christ'; indulging in such wanton desires, they are in spirit and conduct in opposition to Christ. It is "to surrender oneself to a carnal and luxurious course of life, as antagonistic to the claims and calling of Christ." (Fairbairn.) **They will marry**—rather, as Revised Version, *desire to marry;* yielding thus to wanton desire, they will seek a remarriage. This will become in them a dominant passion and purpose, coloring and directing their spirit and life. Their sin was not in their remarriage, to which, indeed, the apostle here counsels them, but in the wanton desire for it, which led to a condition of mind and a course of conduct such as involves the loss of that faith which they had at their conversion.

12. Having damnation (*condemnation*)—from God; not necessarily, however, eternal condemnation, but as erring children falling under his displeasure and consequent chastisement. Perhaps, also, the condemnation is not to be excluded which their conduct called forth from others, and even from their own consciences. **Because they have cast off their first faith.** In yielding to such an earthly, sensual disposition, they showed that in heart they had fallen away from their original faith in Christ. "The writer 'by faith' understands the inner faith-relation to Christ, the real faith-life, which to him is always essentially conditioned on a good conscience and a fulfilling of moral duty. So now here: these wanton, husband-seeking widows came into a condition in which . . . they lay on themselves condemnation." (Beck.) 'First faith' here does not, as some suppose, signify a formal promise of perpetual widowhood, made on being enrolled among the widows; for of such a promise there is no trace in Scripture, and it is in itself wholly foreign to the spirit of the gospel. This vow, like the office of presbyteress with which it was connected, is not found in the Christian Church until more than a century after this Epistle was written, a period when the asceticism which the apostle here deprecates had triumphed in the church. It was easy for Tertullian, and the Fathers who followed him, to find here a vow of widowhood, because in their age celibacy had come to be regarded as superior to marriage; but surely a sober and reverent exegesis should reject so false a principle of interpretation which imputes the perverted ideas of that far later period to the simple, pure words of God. The Most High nowhere puts dishonor on marriage, that first and holiest institution he established

13 And withal they learn *to be* idle, wandering about from house to house; and not only idle, but tattlers also and busybodies, speaking things which they ought not.
14 I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully.

13 they have rejected their first [1]pledge. And withal they learn also *to be* idle, going about from house to house; and not only idle, but tattlers also and busy-
14 bodies, speaking things which they ought not. I desire therefore that the younger [2]*widows* marry, bear children, rule the household, give none

1 Gr. *faith*.....2 Or, *women*.

on earth; and all attempts of man to set aside or to lower and degrade this primal ordinance of heaven have perpetually tended, not to holiness, but to the degradation of woman and the diffusion of immorality through society. The interpretation here of such a vow, while thus doubtful as resting on a palpable anachronism and as adverse to the spirit of the gospel, is also inconsistent with the language and context. For 1. 'Faith' (πίστις) is used to express *a vow* or *promise* only in rare and exceptional cases, where the context clearly indicates the departure from the usual sense. 2. No intimation is given, by transitional word or otherwise, that the apostle, at verse 9, changes his subject from the temporal support of widows to their induction into a church office; on the contrary, verse 16, which clearly relates to the temporal support of widows, shows that the subject remains unchanged through the whole passage, from verse 3 to verse 16. The plain meaning is, therefore, that in giving themselves up to a frivolous, earthly, sensual disposition and habit, they destroyed the simplicity and purity of that faith in Christ which they had professed in baptism, and from which issues a life dedicated to God. "If this faith referred to a promise not to remarry, it could not be called their 'first faith.'" (Whitby.) Thus Calvin, Bengel, Fairbairn.

13. And withal they learn to be idle, wandering about from house to house—a further reason why widows under sixty should not be taken into the number supported by the church; for, thus freed from the necessity of self-support, they fall into idleness, with all the evil dispositions and habits it engenders. The apostle uses the present tense because he is speaking of an evil which must naturally result from such a cause and which was already apparent. (Ver. 15.) The facts, therefore, justified this restriction as to age; for the younger widows, thereby left to their own resources, would be impelled to honorable industry and be preserved from the dangers always consequent on idleness. **And not only idle, but tattlers also**—*loose*, or *trifling talkers*, *tale-bearers*. **And busybodies**—meddling in matters that do not concern them, mischief-makers. **Speaking things which they ought not.** The common results of idleness: it makes gossips, tale-bearers, meddlers in other people's matters. The inspired pen has here drawn the true picture of many an idle and worse than wasted life, degrading, bemiring itself in the filthy slime of social gossip and scandal, instead of ennobling and elevating itself in the service of Christ. The remedy for this, as here indicated, is in devolving on them as far as possible the duty of self-support, and in encouraging them to re-enter the married state, as opening to them their natural sphere of development and usefulness.

14. I will, therefore, that the younger women marry. 'Women,' supplied in the Common Version, is not found in the Greek; and as widows here form the subject of the context, it is plainly of them the apostle speaks. In view of the ill results which have followed, and which, in the nature of the case, will be likely to follow the reception of the younger widows among those supported by the church, *therefore* he gives it as his apostolic counsel and desire that they remarry, because this would place them in normal and safe relations. **Bear children, guide the house.** Thus placed in the varied duties of the home life, as presiding over a family, they would be preserved from temptation and would be likely to honor the Christian profession. **Give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully,** 'adversary,' probably here referring to the Jew or Gentile opposer of the gospel, who was ever seeking occasion for reproach of it in the failings and misconduct of those who professed it. (Titus 2:8.) "He who is of the contrary part." (Phil. 1:28.) Here, as elsewhere, the apostle presents home life as woman's best refuge from social dangers, and as the true nursery of the purest and noblest womanly

15 For some are already turned aside after Satan.
16 If any man or woman that believeth have widows, let them relieve them, and let not the church be charged; that it may relieve them that are widows indeed.

15 occasion to the adversary for reviling: for already
16 some are turned aside after Satan. If any woman that believeth hath widows, let her relieve them, and let not the church be burdened; that it may relieve them who are widows indeed.

virtues; and that asceticism which forbids or depreciates marriage he regards as the prolific fountain of social degradation and wrong. All history has confirmed this teaching of Holy Writ; the virtue, and consequently the strength and welfare, of any people is in its homes. The destruction of family life has always wrought social demoralization and national ruin. The only occasion when Paul discouraged marriage was in the presence of impending persecution, when he counseled temporary abstinence as "good for the present distress," but even then accorded perfect freedom to each to act in the matter as his own convictions might dictate. (1 Cor. 7:7, 8, 26, 32-34.).

15. For some are already turned aside after Satan. Referring doubtless to well-known cases at Ephesus, where young widows, after being enrolled among those supported by the church, had shown these tendencies to evil, and had thus given occasion for reproach. This fact he presents, not merely as a warning to others, but as a reason for the restriction, apparently now first made, as to age in the reception of widows, and for the direction that the younger, instead of relying on church support, should remarry.

16. If any man or woman that believeth have widows, let them relieve them. An extension of the duty enjoined in verses 4, 8, requiring the relief of widows more distantly related than mother or grandmother. Probably also the special reference is, as the context suggests, to those among the younger widows who for any cause did not remarry, and who, if they had children, might not be able to derive support from them in consequence of their yet tender age. To such a widowed relative, though more distantly related, as sister or cousin, aunt or niece, it is the duty of Christian kindred or friends to supply needed relief. **And let not the church be burdened, that it may relieve them that are widows indeed.** Relieved of the burden of supporting these younger widows and such as had relatives, the church could reserve its means for the support of those who, being without kindred, and of an age incapable of self-support, are, in a true and absolute sense, widows. Most of the oldest manuscripts, as the Sinaitic, Alexandrian, and Ephraim, with some verses, read: *If any woman that believeth.* The words, prefixed in the Common Version, 'man or,' were probably added in later manuscripts as a correction, because the mention of woman only seemed singular. But the apostle is here speaking specially of woman's duty, and would perhaps naturally speak of the female, rather than the male, head of the family, because she also would be most nearly affected by the addition of such widows to the family.

The fundamental conceptions of church charity unfolded in this passage have been justified by all experience in eleemosynary work. Indiscriminate charity has always proved a serious evil. In the beneficiaries, it has fostered indolence and pauperism, with all the vices that attend them; while in the benefactors, it has constantly tended, from the palpable evils resulting, to dry up the fountain of beneficence. Hence the divine wisdom of the method here prescribed. 1. The charity is to be bestowed in such spirit and manner as not to degrade, but to elevate and benefit the needy. 'Honor widows,' as recognizing their relation to Christ, and the relief bestowed as bestowed on Christ, who is represented in them, as suffering members of his body. (Matt. 25:40.) All almsgiving should be done as unto Christ, and in such manner as to preserve and develop a genuine self-respect in the recipient. 2. The church should assume the full support only, (*a*) when age and desolation exist such as preclude self-support and relief from kindred; and (*b*) when the previous character and life have been such that the recipient is a fitting ward of the church, and will not bring dishonor on the bounty bestowed. The church will, indeed, show kindness, as far as in her power, to all needy ones, and even to the unworthy; but, as regards widows, she is not to assume the *full* support, and thus make wards, of any except such as present these conditions. This restriction of honorable support to the aged who also had previously borne an honorable character, would serve at once to stimulate the charitable

17 Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine.

17 Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially those who labour in the

contribution of the church for this object, by the assurance that it was well bestowed, and to make the provision an encouragement, not to improvident and unworthy living, but to the prudent and virtuous conduct of life. In the possible event of a bereft and helpless old age, every true wife and mother had the hope that in the bosom of the church she would find an honorable refuge from want; while yet the church, in offering to her such a prospect, did not encourage idle and vicious living, by opening an asylum for the improvident and undeserving. 3. Christian charity should find its outlet, not so much through public, organized church work, as through individual, private acts of kindness. Hence the apostle throughout this passage seeks to develop to the utmost private beneficence in the relief of the needy, and to reduce within the smallest possible limit the sphere of public, formal church support. (Ver. 4, 8, 10, 16.) For, as it respects both the benefactor and the recipient, personal rather than official beneficence is that which confers the richest and most ennobling blessings.

17-25. DIRECTIONS RESPECTING THE COMPENSATION, DISCIPLINE, AND SELECTION OF ELDERS.—1. Elders who excel in the pastoral office, especially those who give themselves to preaching and instruction, are entitled to liberal compensation, as is shown from both Scripture and reason. (17, 18.) 2. Discipline should be instituted against an elder only when the charge is supported by the testimony of two or three witnesses; but those who are convicted as living in sin should be rebuked before the whole church, that the rest may fear to sin. (19, 20.) 3. In dealing with the elders, Timothy is solemnly charged, as in the sight of God and Christ and all holy beings, to observe these instructions, acting without prejudice or partiality; as also to avoid rashness in setting men apart to the eldership, since, otherwise, by his neglect to ascertain their character, he would become a virtual sharer in their sins, if they proved unworthy. (21, 22.) 4. As men are differently constituted, some revealing plainly and at once their real character, while others conceal it, he is urged to use caution and patience in forming his judgment of men, but is encouraged also by the assurance that the real character, however concealed, will sooner or later be fully manifested. (24, 25.)

17. Let the elders that rule well—that is, those who are distinguished for success in presiding over the church and its interests; men who show marked ability in developing, organizing, and guiding the activities of the church, and in the care and help of souls. **Be counted worthy of double honour**—rather, of double consideration, involving here, as in ver. 3, a consideration or regard which finds expression in pecuniary reward. Observe: they are not to receive double compensation as a mere gratuity, but are to "be counted worthy" of it. It is their due, and is to be paid, therefore, as a just debt. Thus always in the Bible: the payment of God's ministers is never made a gratuity, but always a matter of obligation. **Especially they who labour in the word and doctrine,** or, *in preaching and instruction.* This does not imply, as some have supposed, two distinct orders of elders, one order only ruling, and the other both ruling and preaching; for, according to uniform New Testament testimony, the double function of ruling and preaching belonged to *all* presbyters. For 1. The qualifications for both these duties were required for admission to the office (3 : 2, 4, 5; Titus 1 : 9); none could enter, unless both "apt to teach" and qualified "to take care of the church of God." 2. Teaching is everywhere found combined with ruling in the functions of the elder. Paul, in addressing the elders of Ephesus, proposes to them his own work, both in spiritual oversight and in public and private teaching, as an example, illustrating and enforcing their duties. (Acts 20 : 20, 21, 28, 31, 35.) Thus elsewhere: "Remember them that *have the rule over you,* who *have spoken* unto you the word of God." (Heb. 13 : 7, 17; 1 Thess. 5 : 12.) With these plain statements this passage is in full accord: it furnishes no evidence of a class of ruling elders, distinct from those who preached. The simple and natural interpretation is this: The apostolic churches, certainly the larger ones like that at Ephesus, had a plurality of elders; but all of these, though of equal authority and like function, did not possess in an equal degree the same

18 For the Scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, the labourer is worthy of his reward.
19 Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses.
20 Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear.

18 word and in teaching. For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn. And, The labourer is worthy of his
19 hire. Against an elder receive not an accusation, except at *the mouth of* two or three witnesses.
20 Them that sin reprove in the sight of all, that the

gifts. While one was eminent in the pastoral care, another excelled in preaching; and still another was distinguished in both these departments, and, thus specially gifted, devoted his whole time to the office. It is of this class Paul here speaks—those who not only rule well, but also excel in public instruction, and who consequently devote themselves wholly to the work. These, he says, should receive, not the ordinary compensation given to elders, but a double or larger compensation, proportioned to the greater time and labor given to the office.

18. For the Scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn—or, *while treading out the grain.* The quotation, taken from Deut. 25 : 4, and introduced by 'for,' is designed to enforce, as a duty, the honorable support of those who give themselves wholly to the ministry. In Palestine, then as now, threshing was ordinarily done by oxen, which were driven over the sheaves, opened and spread on the threshing-floor, to separate the grain from the straw, either simply by treading it with their feet or also by bruising it with a heavy threshing-wain drawn after them. (Hosea 10 : 11.) The farmer sometimes begrudged the poor animals the occasional mouthfuls of straw and grain snatched while treading, and therefore muzzled the oxen. This God forbade—a prohibition, which, while applying literally to oxen, the apostle declares (1 Cor. 9 : 9) was intended to teach, reasoning from the less to the greater, the duty of a generous regard for all who serve us, especially for the ministers of the gospel. If God would have men tenderly regard the needs of oxen, while preparing grain for the earthly garner, much more would he have the church care tenderly for the needs of the ministry, who, toiling in God's spiritual harvest, are preparing souls, as grain of priceless value, for the garner in heaven. The duty of a generous support of the ministry is enforced by Christ himself. (Matt. 10 : 9, 10; Luke 10 : 7); and our apostle elsewhere, with great earnestness, pressess it on the consciences of the people. (1 Cor. 9 : 11-14; Gal. 6 : 6; 1 Thess. 5 : 12, 13.)

And, The labourer is worthy of his reward—probably not intended as a quotation, but language used by the apostle as a common maxim, as indeed it is also used, for a like purpose, by Christ. (Matt. 10. 10 : Luke 10 : 7.) It is not improbable that the apostle knew of its use by Christ; but had he intended to quote as from Christ, he would hardly have quoted it as "Scripture," but would have named Christ as authority. Thus Calvin, Huther, Wiesinger, Alford. Some, however, insist on its quotation from the gospels, and cite 2 Peter 3 : 16, as proof that the books of the New Testament were already regarded as a part of "Scripture." Thus all the ancient interpreters, and among the later, Macknight, Scott, Wordsworth, Fausset, and others.

19. Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses—or, *upon the testimony or authority of two or three witnesses.* The meaning is, not that an elder should not be convicted except on such testimony,—for in *all* cases the Hebrew law required two or three witnesses to convict (Deut. 17 : 6; 19 : 15; Matt. 18 : 16), though a citation for trial might be made on a charge brought by one witness,—but that an accusation should not be entertained, judicial proceedings should not be instituted, unless two or three responsible parties attested the charge. This is required, as a special precaution, in the case of the elder, both because his position creates a presumption in his favor, and because, as a minister, he is peculiarly exposed to malice, and his reputation and influence might be seriously injured by the entertaining of a charge, though on the trial he was acquitted. The influence of even the best minister might be destroyed, if idle gossip and social tattling were accounted a sufficient ground for serious charges and judicial proceedings.

20. Them that sin—or, *are sinning*—that is, are convicted as living in sin. It refers not to such as are "overtaken in a fault" (Gal. 6 : 1), but to those with whom some form of sin has

21 I charge *thee* before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality.
22 Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins: keep thyself pure.

21 rest also may be in fear. I charge *thee* in the sight of God, and Christ Jesus, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without [1] prejudice, doing
22 nothing by partiality. Lay hands hastily on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins: keep

1 Or, *preference.*

become habitual. This direction, as the context suggests, relates to the case of elders who are convicted as living in sin; and the restriction to these is necessary, if we accept, with some, the reading, *but them that sin*, which is found in some old manuscripts. It is, however, given in a general form, and the direction really applies to all who publicly sin. **Rebuke before all**—before the whole church. The public position of the offenders made their sin public, and there was, therefore, the more danger of its infecting others. A public rebuke in such case would at once vindicate the church from complicity with the sin, and deter others from falling into it. This injunction does not conflict with that in ver. 1: for there the apostle is speaking of personal, private rebuke, while here he speaks of a formal church censure, after due public conviction, and which therefore would be administered as from the church. **That others also may fear**—that is, the rest of the church. Compare 2 Tim. 4; 2; Titus 1: 10–13. The public rebuke would tend to deter others from falling into the sin thus solemnly reprobated.

21. I charge thee before God—not an adjuration, but a solemn charge, given as in full view of God and Christ and holy angels, who are conceived as witnessing and joining in it. The apostle, in giving the charge, and Timothy in fulfilling it, are under the direct gaze of the spiritual world. Compare 1 Thess. 4: 6; 2 Tim. 2: 14; 4: 1. Others interpret of the future judgment, when the whole spiritual universe will be present, and each human life will be revealed in that solemn and glorious Presence. **And the Lord Jesus Christ**—the word 'Lord' is not in the Sinaitic, Alexandrian, Claromontanus, and other old manuscripts, and is wanting in many ancient versions and Fathers. **And the elect angels**—referring to the holy angels, as distinguished from the "angels which kept not their first estate." 'Elect' designates them as the special objects of God's love, and the chosen ministers of his will. It is as in the presence of God and Christ and all holy intelligences in the universe, the apostle lays this charge on his assistant, requiring him to act in the affairs of the church, and especially in those relating to the ministry, as in full view of this august, but invisible Presence. The interest and participation of angels in the events of this world, especially in the work of redemption, are seen in Matt. 18: 10; Luke 15: 10; 1 Cor. 4: 9; Heb. 1: 14; 12: 22. **That thou observe these things**—referring to the things enjoined. (Ver. 19, 20.) **Without preferring one before another**—or, *without prejudice or prejudgment.* He is not to prejudge any case, but to bring to the investigation a calm, unbiased, judicial mind, prepared to weigh fairly the evidence, and to decide strictly according to truth. **Doing nothing by partiality**—not only is he to avoid an intellectual prejudgment, but he is to act with impartial heart, without bias of feeling, allowing neither affection nor aversion to influence his decision for one against another. The consciousness of the presence and gaze of the heavenly world would lift him above passion and prejudice, and fit him to act with caution and impartiality in the discipline of the church, and especially of the ministry.

22. Lay hands suddenly (*hastily*) **on no man**—that is, without due inquiry and deliberation. Some refer this to an imposition of hands customary on the readmission of excluded persons to the church; they regard this verse, therefore, as a caution against the hasty and inconsiderate restoration of such to church fellowship. Such a custom, without doubt, existed in the third century, as it is mentioned by Cyprian; but as it is nowhere alluded to in Scripture, as Paul uses "the laying on of hands" in these Epistles only of ordination (4: 14; 2 Tim. 1: 7), and as the Fathers nearest to the apostolic age so interpret it, the phrase should probably be understood here of ordination to the ministry. The hasty admission of men to the ministry would be likely to result in ministerial irregularities and offenses; the caution, therefore, against hasty ordination is here naturally connected with the subject of

23 Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities.
24 Some men's sins are open beforehand, going before to judgment; and some *men* they follow after.

23 thyself pure. Be no longer a drinker of water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine
24 often infirmities. Some men's sins are evident, going before unto judgment; and some men also

ministerial discipline. Thus all the older interpreters, with Grotius, Macknight, Van Oosterzee, Alford, Fairbairn, and others, among the modern. (3:6.) **Neither be partaker of other men's sins**—as he would be, if, through want of due consideration in setting apart ministers, he should appoint the unworthy, and thereby scandal come on the church. Even Christ, when choosing the twelve apostles, decided on the persons to be set apart only after most of them had been with him for at least a year, and then only after a night spent in prayer. (Luke 6:12-16.) Paul and Barnabas, in their first mission, though they made many converts on their outward journey, did not ordain elders until they returned homeward, when there had been time to test the character of the converts, and a wise judgment was possible in making selection for official and responsible station. (Acts 14:21-23.) This caution in appointing to the sacred office, which appears so conspicuously in Scripture, should be sacredly observed; for the church and the presbytery which neglect it become sharers in the sins of those whom they thus recklessly place in positions of trust and authority. **Keep thyself pure**—literally, *thyself keep pure*, that thou mayest be fitted to rebuke sin in others. 'Pure,' not merely *chaste*, but, in reference to the whole outward life, *blameless*, *holy*. (2 Cor. 7:11; Phil. 4:8; 1 John 3:3.) Present in thyself an example of purity, so as to be prepared to demand a like purity in those who would enter the sacred office. "While thou hast to act as judge upon other men, be morally pure thyself." (Ellicott.)

23. Drink no longer water, but use a little wine—literally, *Be no longer a water drinker;* that is, one who makes water his exclusive drink. It seems that Timothy was a total abstainer from wine. The reason of this is not stated, but probably he abstained as an example, to deter others from the use of strong drink, which then, as now, was a prevailing and destructive vice. Some suppose that an ascetic tendency restrained him; but the apostle bases his advice to 'use a little wine,' not on this ground, but solely on the needs of his health—a reason in itself adequate, and beyond which we need not pass. **For thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities**—or, *oft-recurring ailments.* A little wine, in the apostle's judgment, was required as a medicine. Timothy was afflicted with bodily weakness, often recurring, and doubtless hindering his work; and Paul suggests wine as the remedy. "These frequent infirmities perhaps explain the timidity of Timothy's character." (Farrar.) This morbid timidity might impair the vigor and firmness so essential in the administration of discipline, especially in the discipline of presbyters; and hence this direction in regard to care in giving increased tone to his bodily health. Thus Alford. Two suggestions may here be made: 1. It is the duty of ministers to exercise due care for their health; there is neither wisdom nor piety in neglecting means to secure and retain that bodily vigor on which usefulness must so largely depend. "God wills that people should take all due care of their bodies. As we are not to make them our masters, so neither our slaves; but to use them so as they may be most fit and helpful to us in the service of God." (Henry.) 2. No inference can be drawn from this passage for the use of wine as a beverage; it is here advised solely as a medicine, in view of oft-recurring bodily ailments. Indeed, the fact that Timothy was himself an abstainer, and that the apostle only advises wine as a remedial agent, suggests that Paul did not favor its use as a beverage. Plainly, no one can rightfully plead the sanction of Paul for the use of wine, unless he has the bodily ailments for which alone Timothy was advised to use it.

24. Some men's sins are open beforehand—requiring no difficult investigation to discover and expose them. **Going before to judgment.** They are "crying sins"; plain, open violations of God's laws, thus 'going before,' or anticipating judgment. **And some men they follow after.** Their sins being concealed, stand revealed only after investigation, or by their results. Such men, under a fair exterior have a rotten character; and only careful inquiry, or the developments of time and providence, will reveal it. Thus

25 Likewise also the good works *of some* are manifest beforehand; and they that are otherwise cannot be hid.

25 they follow after. In like manner also [1]there are good works that are evident; and such as are otherwise cannot be hid.

CHAPTER VI.

LET as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God and *his* doctrine be not blasphemed.

1 Let as many as are [2]servants under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God and the doctrine be not blasphemed.

1 Gr. *the works that are good are evident*.....2 Gr. *bondservants.*

their sins do not precede, but rather follow trial or judgment.

25. Likewise also. This difference in the manifestation of character in the wicked is also seen in the righteous. **The good works of some are manifest beforehand**—they stand out before the eyes of all, revealing at once and distinctly the true character of those who perform them. **And they that are otherwise cannot be hid**—that is, the good works that are not now openly manifest cannot be hid. The good works of others are less openly manifest, rendering it more difficult to decide as to their character; but even in these cases their righteousness will sooner or later be revealed. It is an eternal law that character, whether good or bad, tends to reveal itself, and will in the end stand forth distinctly apparent. "There is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, and hid that shall not be known." (Matt. 10 : 26.) The design of verses 24 and 25 is at once to encourage and to caution Timothy in reference to the judgment of character necessary in setting apart men for the ministry, and in the disciplinary work of the church. The task was difficult, requiring great caution and discrimination, because men are so differently constituted as to the manifestation of character. Hence, he should exercise patience, forming no hasty judgment, contenting himself with no partial, imperfect investigation; and should proceed in ordination or discipline only after thorough examination and trial, assured that patient investigation and the testing of time will at last develop the real character, however concealed.

Ch. 6 : 1, 2. DUTIES OF CHRISTIAN SLAVES TO THEIR MASTERS.—1. If the masters are unbelievers, they are to render to them all due honor, averting the reproach to God and his gospel which the opposite course would occasion. 2. If the masters are believers, Christian slaves are not to despise their authority as masters, because they are brethren in Christ; but all the more to render them service, because those who receive the benefit of the service are believing and beloved.

1. Let as many servants as are under the yoke. The word here translated 'servant' (δοῦλος), signifies: 1. A *slave*, one held in involuntary servitude. Thus 1 Cor. 7 : 21; Gal. 3 : 28; Col. 3 : 11; Rev. 6 : 15, in all which the bond-servant is contrasted with the free man. Possibly also, as in Matt. 18 : 23–26, it sometimes designates servants in general. 2. A *servant*, or one who voluntarily submits his will and capacity to the sway of another. Thus, "Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin" (John 8 : 34); and "servants of sin," "servants of righteousness." (Rom. 6 : 16-22.) In this sense, as self-devoted, without reserve, to God, Christians are called "the servants (δοῦλοι) of God." (1 Peter 2 : 16.) 3. A *servant*, as one who is not only devoted absolutely to God, but who is also set apart by him for a special service. Thus Paul is "a servant of God" (Rom. 1 : 1; Phil. 1 . 1), and the other apostles (James 1 : 1; 2 Peter 1 : 1; Jude 1); so also Moses (Rev. 15 : 3), and even Christ (Phil. 2 : 7). In these cases involuntariness is excluded from the conception, and the word designates one who yields himself, in the voluntary self-devotement of all the faculties of his being, to the will and service of God. Here the words "under the yoke" show that the term is used in the first sense —*slaves*, bondmen, in a state of involuntary servitude. **Count their own masters worthy of all honour.** The Christian slave was not to suppose that, because of his exalted heavenly calling, he was released from the duties of his earthly station; rather, his profession as a Christian should lead him to still higher fidelity to them, so that his master, though unbelieving, would be compelled, by his cheerful and faithful service, to acknowledge the excellence of his religion instead of

2 And they that have believing masters, let them not despise *them*, because they are brethren: but rather do *them* service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort.

2 And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but let them serve them the rather, because they that [1] partake of the benefit are believing and beloved. These things teach and exhort.

1 Or, *lay hold of.*

blaspheming the Christian's God and the gospel. (Titus 2 : 9, 10.) **That the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed.** It was charged against Israel, "The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you." (Rom. 2 : 24.) The avoidance of all occasion of reproach on the part of unbelievers is specially enjoined on Christians. (Titus 2 : 5, 10.)

Slavery formed a prominent feature in the ancient world. In the classic period, Athens is said to have had twenty thousand free men and four hundred thousand slaves. Gibbon estimates that in the apostolic age the slave population in the Roman Empire equaled that of the free, an estimate which, though usually regarded as too low, makes the number of slaves at least sixty millions. Acquired, originally, either from captives taken in war or from slave dealers, this vast multitude, forming half the empire, were held in perpetual servitude, and were bought and sold like cattle in the market. Servile insurrections were frequent, and were terrific in the passions they developed, and the devastation and blood that attended them. It was an ever-present, ghastly peril, a terrible force, which, like a pent-up volcano, momentarily threatened to break forth, and overwhelm in destruction the whole fabric of the Roman state and civilization. This gigantic social wrong Christianity met. It did not, however, propose an instant and violent disruption of the slave's bonds; for thus it could only have made itself a terror to society, as fomenting a socialistic revolution, and menacing the destruction of that social order on which the security of life and property depends. But it antagonized the evil, as Moses had done in the earlier Dispensation, not by formal enactment abolishing at once the civil relation, but by the inculcation of principles and the establishment of relations, such as must inevitably work its ultimate removal. It did not proclaim civil freedom to the slave, but it gave him a spiritual freedom, which ennobled and blessed even his servile condition. It taught him, "If thou mayest be free, use it rather" —freedom is to be chosen rather than bondage; but if the yoke may not be broken, be not restive under it. Rather look on thy position as the post of duty divinely appointed for thee, and serve therein as doing service, not to man, but to God. It thus elevated the character and blessed the life of the slave, by exalting even his menial toil into a Christ-service, at once ennobling and divine; and the Christian, while in outward relation a bondman, was in spirit the Lord's free man. See 1 Cor. 7 : 20–24; Eph. 6 : 5–8; Col. 3 : 22; Titus 2 : 9; 1 Peter 2 : 18–21. On the other hand, the great doctrines, that God made all men of one blood, and, therefore, by nature equal in rights; that Christ "gave himself a ransom for all," and before him, therefore, all believers, as alike redeemed by his blood and made members of his body, are essentially equal, without distinction of bond or free; and that in the church, all—alike the slave and the free man—have an equal voice, and stand on the same footing: these primary, essential principles of the gospel, as they permeated Christian life, must destroy all arbitrary, oppressive social distinctions, and create a Christian civilization, in which all men would find equality before human law, as they had equality in the sight of God. Indeed, the express injunctions laid on Christian masters insured to the slave even then, if not an immediate legal emancipation, at least the essential advantages of freedom. (Eph. 6 : 9; Gal. 3 : 28; Col. 4 : 1.)

2. And they that have believing masters—Christian slaves whose masters are also Christians—**let them not despise them, because they are brethren**—an obvious danger. In the spiritual kingdom they were one in Christ Jesus, brethren invested with equal rights; and they might easily think that this destroyed the earthly relation of master and slave. But this new and higher spiritual relation, the apostle insists, though it must essentially influence and modify the civil relation, did not dissolve it. Spiritual enfranchisement was not civil enfranchisement. In

3 If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, *even* the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness;

3 If any man teacheth a different doctrine, and consenteth not to [1] sound words, *even* the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which

1 Gr. *healthful.*

earthly station they were still master and slave; and he forbids that Christian slaves, taking advantage of their spiritual equality with their masters, should cease to honor and obey them in the civil relation. **But rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit**—or, *but all the more serve them, because they who partake of the benefit are believing and beloved*, or, because they who (in return for benefits conferred) receive the benefit (of the service) are believing and beloved. The word here translated *partakers* signifies to receive in return for something, as a reciprocal benefit. It implies that, while the masters received the benefit of the slaves' service, that was in fact only a reciprocation of benefit received by the slaves from the masters. The passage thus affords, perhaps, an inlook upon the relations of reciprocal kindness existing between masters and slaves in the apostolic churches. Here the apostle teaches that the Christian character and relations of the master, who shared the benefit of the slaves' service, instead of prompting to discontent and disobedience, should rather prompt to a more cheerful and hearty service. **These things teach and exhort**—the things relating to the honor and obedience due from slaves to their masters. It was the duty of Timothy to teach and guard the Christian slaves against the doctrine and spirit of servile insurrection, then so widely and disastrously threatening the foundations of society in the Roman world.

3-5. THE EVIL CHARACTER AND INFLUENCE OF HIM WHO, OPPOSING THIS INSTRUCTION, TEACHES A DIFFERENT DOCTRINE.—He is characterized: 1. As one who does not assent to the healthful words of Christ, and to the teaching which accords with godliness. (3.) 2. As one who is puffed up with self-conceit, though he has in fact no right apprehension of truth, but is morbidly eager for needless and hurtful disputation. (4.) 3. The controversies thus fomented by him excite only evil passions and continual animosities in such as are corrupted in mind and bereft of the truth, who evince their corruption and error in that they regard piety only as a means of earthly gain. (4, 5.)

3. If any man teach otherwise—that is, any other doctrine than that here taught, referring primarily to the instruction just given in regard to slaves; but, as the form of statement is general, it perhaps comprehends all teaching contrary to that of the apostle. Compare ch. 1 : 3–7. It seems probable that the false teachers referred to in this Epistle, among other perversions of the gospel, taught a false view of Christian freedom and social order, socialistic and anarchical doctrines, adapted to inflame the different classes of society against each other, and to excite a social revolution. They thus made Christianity a mere instrument for the reorganization of society, and the securing of political and social equality. It is evident that such teaching, while it wholly ignored the spiritual significance and value of the gospel, must be in the highest degree dangerous in a social condition where at least one-half the population were slaves. It could result only in revolution and anarchy. Hence, the frequency and urgency with which Paul inculcates on slaves the duty of obedience to their masters; while yet he nowhere affirms the rightfulness of the relation of master and slave, but everywhere teaches doctrines and establishes institutions which, with silent and potent force, must in the end work its destruction. **And consent not to wholesome words**—or, *does not accede to words morally healthful*, adapted to the health of the individual soul and of society. 'Wholesome.' Compare 1 : 10; 2 Tim. 1 : 13; 4 : 3. Titus 1 : 9, 13; 2 : 1, 2. The gospel, faithfully preached, tends to the moral health of a community, purifying, elevating, and ennobling men in every relation of life. It makes men better in the family, in society, in the state, and thus uplifts and blesses the life of mankind, promotes law and order, and diffuses intelligence and happiness. **Even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ.** These health-giving words are the words of Christ, who ever taught the patient endurance rather than the violent resistance of wrong. (Matt. 5 : 38-48.) Pos-

4 He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings,
5 Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself.

4 is according to godliness; he is puffed up, knowing nothing, but [1]doting about questionings and disputes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, wranglings of men corrupted
5 in mind and bereft of the truth, supposing that god-

1 Gr. *sick.*

sibly the apostle refers to his own words as the words of Christ, since the gospel he preached was not received from man, "but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." (Gal. 1:11, 12.) **And to the doctrine which is according to godliness**—doctrine that accords with and tends to godliness.

4. He is proud (*puffed up*)—literally, *enveloped in smoke*, besotted with self-conceit. (3:6.) "He is a vaporer, enveloped with self-conceit." (Beck.) "Commonly those are most proud who know least; for with all their knowledge, they do not know themselves." (Henry.) **Knowing nothing**—or, *although he understands nothing*, has no right apprehension of the gospel. (1:7.) **But doting about**—or, *is sick about, is morbidly eager for*—**questions and strifes of words.** Diseased in mind, he fails to apprehend the substantial truths of religion, and is morbidly contentious about questions of no real moment. His state is the reverse of that spiritual health which the *wholesome* words of the gospel bring. **Whereof cometh.** As before the apostle has shown the mentally diseased condition of these men, he now points out the results that flow from it. The questionings and word strifes fostered by this morbid spirit of contention inflame the worst passions and animosities among men—that is, among these false teachers and those who follow them. **Envy**—making the slave envious of the master, the poor of the rich, the afflicted and unfortunate of the prosperous, thus producing discontent and murmuring. **Strife**—envy naturally leads to discord in word and act. **Railings**—or, *evil speaking*, harsh and abusive language, a common result of disputes, especially when inspired by erroneous views. **Evil surmisings**—those harsh suspicions of each other's motives and intentions which arise when confidence and charity have been lost.

5. Perverse disputings—or, *lasting disputes, stubborn contentions*, the word as found in the best text signifying wranglings that are perpetual. **Of men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth**—rather, *corrupted in mind and bereft of the truth;* descriptive of the men to whom the preceding characteristics belong, as 'envy, strife,' etc. *Mind* (τὸν νοῦν) includes here the intellect as well as the moral nature; the whole inner man, mental and spiritual, is corrupted. (Titus 1:15.) The word rendered *destitute* means, not barely without the truth, but bereft of the truth, either as for the time despoiled of the truth by Satanic temptation, or as permanently given over by God to judicial blindness, to "strong delusion that they should believe a lie." (2 Thess. 2:9-12.) Perverted in their inmost life, they had neither susceptibility to spiritual truth, nor power to apprehend it. **Supposing that gain is godliness**—rather, *that godliness is a means of gain;* "a way of advancing one's worldly interests" (Fausset); "a traffic for gain" (Wordsworth); "a gainful trade" (Conybeare). The proof that they are *bereft of the truth* is found in their false and debasing conception of godliness, or religion, as something to be used only for mere earthly welfare. Their unworthy thought of religion proved their destitution of it. (Acts 8:20.) They valued the gospel only as it secured worldly advantage in wealth and social distinction. Probably the apostle has in view: 1. Those socialistic agitators, who regarded the gospel simply as an instrument to reconstruct society, by rousing the animosities of the different classes against each other, and fomenting a social revolution, through which all oppressive distinctions should be destroyed by outward violence; and who, in thus viewing religion, utterly failed to apprehend, alike its spiritual nature and aims, and its method of blessing the outward condition of men by first elevating and ennobling the spiritual condition. 2. Those false religious professors, who use their position in the church as a means of worldly advantage, in promoting their business, their social position, or their political preferment. (1 Thess. 2:5; Titus 1:11.) In both cases such a debasing conception of the gospel proves them to be "men corrupted in mind

6 But godliness with contentment is great gain.
7 For we brought nothing into *this* world, *and it is* certain we can carry nothing out.
8 And having food and raiment, let us be therewith content.

6 liness is a way of gain. But godliness with content-
7 ment is great gain: for we brought nothing into the
8 world, for neither can we carry anything out; but having food and covering [1] we shall be therewith

1 Or, *in these we shall have enough.*

and bereft of the truth." **From such withdraw thyself.** These words are wanting in the Sinaitic, Alexandrian, and most other ancient manuscripts, as also in most of the versions; they should be rejected from the text, as not genuine.

6-10. PIETY WITH CONTENTMENT IS GREAT GAIN.—This is shown—1. From the reasonableness of contentment, in that (*a*) our entrance into the world with nothing was intended to remind us that we can carry nothing out of it, and that it is folly, therefore, to be anxious about earthly goods; (*b*) if we have food and covering, all our real needs are in fact met. (7, 8.) 2. From the evils of the love of money, in that (*a*) those who are eager for riches fall into temptation and sin, which end in their destruction; (*b*) the love of money is a root from which springs every form of evil, and, as the result of it, some have destroyed alike their faith and their happiness. (9, 10.)

6. But—though godliness is thus misconceived and perverted as a means of earthly gain, yet there is a sense in which it is, even in this life, great gain. **Godliness with contentment.** The word rendered 'contentment' signifies *self-sufficiency*, denoting the state of one who has within himself the means of satisfying all his desires, and is not dependent therefor on external conditions. It is rendered in 2 Cor. 9 : 8 "sufficiency." The adjective is found. (PHIL. 4 : 11.) "I have learned in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content"—or, *to have a sufficiency in myself*, to be independent of outward circumstances. This is not the proud independence of the stoic, but that elevation of soul above external earthly conditions which comes from a consciousness of God's presence and love, and all-sufficing providence. (PS. 23; 37 : 16-29; PROV. 14 : 14.) **Is great gain.** Piety, when thus an all-sufficing power within the soul, is the highest means of gain. It brings the absolute riches, since it not only satisfies every conscious want, but also fills the soul with positive blessedness. It is an exhaustless fountain of blessing within, "a well of water, springing up into everlasting life." See Heb. 13 : 5, 6. "The heart, amid every outward want, is then only truly rich, not merely when it feels no need of what it has not, but when it has that which exalts it above what it has not." (Wiesinger.) "In this concise and weighty sentence the apostle expresses both these main ideas, that godliness makes us content, and to be content is the highest good." (Van Oosterzee.)

7. For we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out—or, better, *because*, or, *seeing that, neither can we carry anything out;* a reason for contentment. God designed, by our coming into the world with nothing, to remind us that we can carry nothing out of it, and thus show us the folly of anxiety respecting merely earthly goods. The very manner of our birth is a dissuasion from the love of money, as it distinctly shows us that earthly wealth is a mere accident of our existence, a temporary possession, to be left behind when we die. "We are appointed by God to come naked into the world to teach us to remember that we must go naked out of it." (Alford.) "Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither." (JOB 1 : 21; ECCL. 5 : 15; PS. 49 : 16-20.) Only two of the ancient manuscripts, and these of minor importance, contain *it is evident* (δῆλον), the most important omitting it. Probably it was added by some copyist to fill out his conception of the sense. Van Oosterzee, Huther, and others, however, retain it, regarding it as essential to the sense, and supposing that it may have been accidentally dropped out of the best codices.

8. And having food and raiment, let us be therewith content. Our real needs will with these be met. 'Food'—the word is a compound, and denotes *continual* or *sufficient food.* 'Raiment,' covering in general; it may possibly include the dwelling as well as the clothing. It is not barely an exhortation to be content, but a reason for contentment, since, if we have food and covering, we really have sufficient, and, therefore, should be content. These are our actual needs; and,

9 But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and *into* many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition.
10 For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.

9 content. But they that are minded to be rich fall into a temptation and a snare and many foolish and hurtful lusts, such as drown men in destruction and
10 perdition. For the love of money is a root of all [1] kinds of evil: which some reaching after have been led astray from the faith, and have pierced themselves through with many sorrows.

1 Gr. *evils.*

with these sufficed, we have enough. Compare Matt. 6 : 25; James 2 : 15, where human wants are also summed up in food and clothing.

9. But they that will be rich—or, *set their heart on being rich.* It designates, not the rich, but those who aspire after riches, who make this the object of life. "The wealthiest may be rich not in a bad sense; the poorest may covet to be so." (Fausset.) (Ps. 6 : 10.) **Fall into temptation**—are tempted to neglect the highest interests of the soul and the duties due to God, and to use improper means to obtain wealth. (Prov. 28 : 20, 22.) **And a snare**—or, *trap.* The eager desire of riches is a net in which they become entangled—a network of methods and relations in business in which the soul, as the fly in a spider's web, is helplessly held. "The idea here is that they who have this desire become so *entangled* that they cannot easily escape. They become involved in the meshes of worldliness and sin; their movements are so fettered by cares, and inordinate desires, and by artificial wants, that they are no longer freemen." (Barnes.) **And into many foolish and hurtful lusts**—the passions naturally springing out of selfishness become regnant in them. They become envious, overreaching, avaricious, hard-hearted, unscrupulous as to truth and the rights of others. Such passions are 'foolish,' because unworthy of a reasonable and immortal being, and because, even when men thereby secure wealth, they do not obtain happiness. They are 'hurtful,' because they destroy all that is pure and noble in manhood, and insure at last the loss of the soul. **Which** (or, *such as*) **drown men in destruction and perdition.** Of the two words, the latter, by its usage, refers more directly to future punishment (Rom. 9 : 22; Phil. 1 : 28; Rev. 8 : 11), while the former may include also temporal destruction (1 Cor. 5 : 5; 1 Thess. 5 : 3; 2 Thess. 1 : 9); but here they are probably not distinct in meaning, but cumulative for emphasis, equivalent to utter destruction. The image in the verb is not properly of drowning, but of sinking—as of a ship foundering, which sinks and is submerged in the depths of the sea. These lusts wreck the soul, causing it to sink, with its priceless treasure, into the depths of perdition. "The love of money will, in all probability, prove the eternal overthrow of more characters among professing Christians than any other sin, because it is almost the only crime that can be indulged and a profession of religion at the same time supported." (Andrew Fuller.)

10. For—a reason for their 'destruction and perdition.' **The love of money is the** (*a*) **root of all evil**—or, *all evils, all kinds of evil.* It is not said that it is the only root of evil, but that from it all kinds of evil may—and do, in fact—spring. It is a germ, a prolific source of every form of evil. **Which** (that is, money) **while some coveted after**—literally, *stretched themselves after, eagerly pressed after.* **Have erred** (*been led astray*) **from the faith**—that is, from their Christian principles as well as from the true doctrine of the gospel. (1 : 6, 19; 4 1-3.) Moral wrong and doctrinal error are always in Paul conceived as conjoined; the loss of subjective faith in Christ is the fountain of both. On the sin and folly of hoarding earthly wealth, compare the parable of the rich fool. (Luke 12 : 13-21.) **And have pierced themselves through with many sorrows**—as a sword piercing through the soul (Luke 2 : 35), or as "the thorns" of the parable (Matt. 13 : 22). It refers, perhaps, more directly to the pangs of conscience which such experience in view of their sins, but not excluding the miseries that come from the conscious loss of true manhood and the multiplied anxieties and troubles connected with wealth seeking. The lust for wealth thus brings the double loss, of faith and of happiness.

11-16. TIMOTHY CHARGED, AS A MINISTER OF GOD, TO PURSUE HIGHER AND NOBLER OBJECTS.—1. He is exhorted: (*a*) To flee a self-seeking worldliness, and follow the

11 But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness.
12 Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses.
13 I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and *before* Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession;

11 But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love,
12 [1] patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of the faith, lay hold on the life eternal, whereunto thou wast called, and didst confess the good confession
13 in the sight of many witnesses. I charge thee in the sight of God, who [2] quickeneth all things, and of Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed

1 Or, *stedfastness*.....2 Or, *preserveth all things alive.*

virtues of a Christian life; (*b*) to maintain the Christian conflict, seizing with his eye its glorious end, eternal life; and to this he is incited by his divine call to eternal life and his public profession of the gospel. (11, 12.) 2. (*a*) He is solemnly charged, as in the sight of God and of Christ, to fulfill his mission with all purity and fidelity until the appearing of Christ, which God will bring about in his own appointed times; (*b*) the certainty that God will bring to pass Christ's appearing is shown from the character of God, as almighty in power and authority, possessed of underived and unfailing life, exalted above human vision and approach, and worthy of honor and power everlasting. (13–16)

11. But thou—in contrast with the 'some.' (Ver. 10.) **O man of God**—the usual designation of the prophets. (1 Sam. 9 : 6; 1 Kings 17 : 18). Here used of Timothy as one dedicated to the service of God. It suggests his exalted office and mission as a dissuasive from a low, selfish spirit of earthly accumulation. (2 Tim. 3 : 17.) **Flee these things**—the love of money and the manifold evils which attend it. **But follow after righteousness, godliness**—the former denoting rectitude, uprightness in the life toward man; the latter, piety in the life toward God. **Faith, love**—the fontal sources of Christian character and life. **Patience, meekness**—the one signifying a steadfast endurance under trials; the other, a spirit which gently bears wrong without resentment and retaliation. The last is the grace "whose active side is *love* (ἀγάπη), and its passive side *long-suffering* (μακροθυμία)." (Stier.) (2 Tim. 2 : 22.) 'Meekness'—the word, as found in the corrected text, is stronger than that usually rendered meekness, denoting, in an intensive way, *gentleness*, or *tenderness of feeling*.

12. Fight the good fight of faith—literally, *Contend the good contest*, referring to contests in the games, whether boxing, racing, or other forms of contest. The figure, taken from athletes contending in the Greek games, was a common and favorite one with Paul. See 1 Cor. 9 : 24–27; Eph. 6 : 10–17; Phil. 3 : 12–14; 1 Tim. 1 : 18; 2 Tim. 4 : 7. **Lay hold on eternal** (*the everlasting*) **life.** The eye is to be fixed intently on the glorious prize, life eternal, to animate him in the contest. It is elsewhere called "the crown of life" (James 1 : 12), the "unfading crown of glory" (1 Peter 5 : 4). "Fight the good fight of faith; lay hold of (in and by that fight) eternal life." (Winer.) **Whereunto** (*everlasting life*) **thou art also called**—referring to his calling at conversion. Everlasting life, not earthly wealth, was that to which, in becoming a Christian, he was called. **And hast professed a good profession** (or, *confessed a good confession*) **before many witnesses**—alluding to the well-known public confession of the gospel made at baptism. The remembrance that he was called by God to eternal life, and that in the most public manner he had made confession of the gospel, should now incite him to maintain the glorious conflict on which he thus entered, not yielding it to seek mere earthly good.

13. I give thee charge in the sight of God. As in 5 : 21, the apostle here represents God and the spiritual world as present and witnessing both the charge given and the conduct of Timothy in his high office. **Who quickeneth all things**—and who, therefore, if thou art put to death, is able to raise thee up in the resurrection of the just. Or, according to another reading (ζωογονοῦντος),—which is, perhaps, equally attested,—*who preserveth in life all things;* and who, therefore, as omnipotent and omnipresent, is able to protect thee in a courageous defense of the gospel. (Matt. 10 : 29–33.) For this latter word, compare Luke 17 : 33; Acts 7 : 19. It is adopted as the true reading here by Alford, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and most editors. **And be-**

14 That thou keep *this* commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ:
15 Which in his times he shall shew, *who is* the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords;

14 the good confession; that thou keep the commandment, without spot, without reproach, until the
15 appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: which in [1] its own times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of [2] kings, and Lord of

1 Or, *his*.....2 Gr. *them that reign as kings.*

fore Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession—referring to Christ's testimony before Pilate, where he bore witness to his person and his redemptive work (John 18 : 33-38; 19 : 8-11), and then sealed the testimony with his blood. The design is to inspire Timothy with boldness in his great office as an ambassador for Christ, by presenting at once the sure basis of the gospel in Christ's solemn attestation of its truth, and the sublime example of its confession by Christ, even when in peril of death. "Christ died, not only as a Sacrifice, but as a Martyr; and he witnessed a good confession when he was arraigned before Pilate, saying, 'My kingdom is not of this world; I am come to bear witness of the truth.'" (Henry.) 'Witnessed,' testified to it, confirming the certainty of the things confessed by himself making the confession. 'A good confession.' The public confession made by each Christian in his baptism is, for substance, the same which Christ himself made, since it involves the same testimony to his person and work, and acknowledges him as King.

14. That thou keep this commandment—meaning, not some special command, but the charge, or duty, laid on him as a minister, especially as related to the gospel committed to him and to his work in Ephesus. (1 : 18.) **Without spot, unrebukable**—words which may be referred grammatically, either to 'thou' or to 'commmandment,' but seem most naturally to belong to the latter. This charge, then, as a treasure, or a priceless jewel, he is to keep *unstained and without reproach;* a figure in which Timothy is enjoined so to conduct himself in his sacred office that, before God and man, the office shall appear in its true moral purity and lustre, unmarred by defects which shall obscure its dignity and worth, and thus weaken its power. **Until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ**—the visible manifestation of Christ at his Second Coming, which in the New Testament is so often placed in the foreground as the glorious goal of the Christian Dispensation. See Matt. 25 : 31; Acts 1 : 10, 11; 1 Cor. 1 : 8; Phil. 1 : 6–10; 2 Tim. 4 : 1; Titus 2 : 13. The very greatness of the event made it seem near, like some vast mountain, which, as it lifts its lofty summit above the horizon, though actually distant, yet from its magnitude seems within a day's journey. That Paul, however, did not assume to know the time of Christ's Second Coming appears from the expression below, 'in his own times,' which refers it to the as yet unrevealed "times or seasons, which the Father has put in his own power" (Acts 1 : 7); and that he did not regard the 'appearing' as immediately imminent is plain from Rom. 11 : 23–32; 2 Thess. 2 : 1–12, where he predicts the events which must precede it, as, indeed, is also necessarily implied in Eph. 2 : 7. Compare Col. 1 : 26, where he speaks of the *ages* (αἰῶνες) of the New Dispensation as *the ages to come*, implying a series of ages to be unfolded during the Christian period. For 'the appearing' (ἐπιφανέια), compare 2 Thess. 2 : 18. The other words used to denote the Second Coming are *revelation* (ἀποκάλυψις), and *presence* or *coming* (παρουσία); the word here emphasizes the visibility and glory of it, as a manifestation of the now invisible majesty and power of the God-Man.

15. Which in his times he shall show—or, *which* (manifestation) *in his own* (appointed) *times he shall cause to appear.* The events of redemption are everywhere represented as taking place "in due time," or according to an order and time appointed by the Father (Gal. 6 : 9; Titus 1 : 3); and the time of Christ's Second Coming is especially said to be known only by the Father, and to be under his special power. (Mark 13 : 32; Acts 1 : 6, 7.) This verse, therefore, and the following, seem clearly descriptive of God the Father, and the divinity of Christ is shown here only from the fact that the same works and attributes are in other passages ascribed also to him. "*His own* (fitting) *times*—the plural implies successive stages in the manifestation of the kingdom of God, each having its own appropriate time, the regulating principle and knowledge

16 Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom *be* honour and power everlasting. Amen.
17 Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not highminded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy;

16 [1]lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in light unapproachable; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom *be* honour and power eternal. Amen.
17 Charge them that are rich in this present [2]world, that they be not highminded, nor have their hope set on the uncertainty of riches, but on God, who

1 Gr. *them that rule as lords*.....2 Or, *age*.

of which rests with the Father." (Fausset.) **Who is the blessed and only Potentate.** This and the following clauses are appositive in the Greek, defining and unfolding the subject of the preceding verb, 'shall shew'; 'which he'—namely, the blessed and only Potentate—shall shew. 'The only Potentate'—"the only One in the universe possessed of independent right and absolute sovereignty." (Fairbairn.) His almighty power and universal authority are emphasized, because of the transcendent greatness of the event he 'shall shew'—namely, Christ's Second Appearing, with its attending events, the resurrection of the dead, the new heavens and new earth, the final judgment, the glorification of the redeemed church, and the perdition of the ungodly. On the attributes 'blessed' and 'only,' compare the usage, 1 : 11, 17; John 17 : 3. **The King of kings and Lord of lords**—expressive of his sovereign authority and rule, especially as exercised in the affairs of this world. Kings and senates hold their authority only under his sovereign dominion. (Ps. 2.)

16. Who only hath immortality—underived, essential life, as distinguished from created and consequently mutable and destructible life. Creatures are immortal only from the free gift of God. Their life is derived, but his is underived, original, uncreated. "The Father hath life in himself," and possesses thus an absolute immortality. (John 5 : 26.) The attributes here ascribed to the Father are also predicated of the Son. Thus, almighty power (Isa. 9 : 6; Matt. 28 : 18; Rev. 1 : 8); universal sovereighty (Col. 2 : 10; Rev. 17 : 14; 19 : 13); immortality, or essential and fontal life. (John 1 : 4; 5 : 26.) **Dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto.** He dwells in light, which as an atmosphere envelopes him, and to whose dazzling brightness no creature can approach. "Thou coverest thyself with light as with a garment." (Ps. 104 : 2; Dan. 7 : 9, 10; 1 John 1 : 5.) **Whom no man hath seen, nor can see**—or, *whom no one of men* (ever) *saw, or can see.* God, in his essential being, is invisible. He is "the invisible God," hidden in the depths of accessless light, probably, from all created beings. (1 : 17; Col. 1 : 15; Heb. 11 : 27.) "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." (John 1 : 18.) The vision of God, however, is in some sense promised to the saints (compare Matt. 5 : 8; 1 Cor. 13 : 12; 1 John 3 : 2; Rev. 22 : 4); but such vision can never be complete sight, since in the nature of things the finite can never perfectly comprehend the Infinite. **To whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen**—that is, *to whom* (as alone in himself worthy, and to whom only they properly belong) *let honor and power everlasting be ascribed.* 'Amen;' an emphatic word, emphasizing the prayer in the doxology; *even so* may honor and power be truly ascribed to him. See Rom. 11 : 33-36; 1 Tim. 1 : 17; 1 Peter 4 : 11; Jude 25; Rev. 1 : 6; 5 : 13.

17-19. A CHARGE FOR THE RICH.—Resuming here the general subject of ver. 6-10, the apostle, as he had there spoken of those *desiring to be* rich, now directed Timothy to give a special charge to those who *are* rich: 1. To avoid pride and a false trust in earthly wealth, and rather to place their trust on God, by whom all good is given, not to be selfishly hoarded, but to be enjoyed. (17.) 2. To make use of their wealth in blessing others, and thus, by treasuring therefrom a good foundation for the future, lay hold on the true life. (18, 19.)

17. Charge them that are rich in this world. Ephesus was a city noted for its great wealth. Christianity had profoundly moved all classes there, as is clearly indicated in the events recorded in Acts 19; especially in the mob raised by Demetrius and his fellow craftsmen, because "not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia," Paul had "turned away much people," thus bringing their trade in the shrines of Diana into disrepute, and

18 That they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate;
19 Laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life.

18 giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, that they be
19 ready to distribute, [1] willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on the life which is *life* indeed.

1 Or, *ready to sympathise.*

putting a stop to their gains. Evidently some wealthy persons had already entered the church. Ministers are in great danger from an undue deference to the rich, of failing to deal plainly with them; Paul, therefore, lays special injunction on Timothy to set distinctly before them, alike the serious perils and the blessed possibilities of wealth. If rightly used, it may be transmuted into enduring, heavenly riches and made means of attaining the true and real life. **That they be not highminded**—"that they do not carry themselves haughtily." (Bloomfield.) A special danger of the rich. (Rom. 12 : 16.) **Nor trust in uncertain riches**—better, *nor have their hope fixed on the uncertainty of riches. Uncertainty* is the conspicuous quality in earthly wealth, and the apostle is, therefore, "hyperbolically representing the hope as reposed on the very quality of riches which least justified it." (Alford.) A hope fixed on riches is fixed on an uncertainty. See Ps. 62 : 10; Prov. 11 : 28; 23 : 5; Jer. 9 : 23; Matt. 6 : 19, 20; Mark 10 : 24. **But in the living God.** (Ps. 37 : 3-7, 16-26.) The word 'living,' which is wanting in the best manuscripts, was interpolated probably from 4 : 10. **Who giveth us richly all things to enjoy**—or, *for enjoyment.* Instead of being eager for riches, or vain in the possession of them, they should set their hope on God, since it is he who is furnishing richly all things, and that, not as a stimulant to pride or hoarding, but as a means of enjoyment. "To enjoy, not to rest our hearts on." (Wiesinger.) See Eccl. 5 : 18, 19; 2 Peter 1 : 3.

18. That they do good—the purpose God has in giving all things richly to them. It is that they live lives of holy beneficence, as God himself (Ps. 119 : 68; Acts 14 : 17), or, as Christ, "who went about doing good." (Acts 10 : 38.) This is the grand opportunity God gives to the rich; they may transmute this mere earthly and perishable wealth into the true and imperishable riches. **That they be rich in good works**—or, *in noble deeds;* that they use their wealth in noble deeds, and thus acquire the enduring, eternal wealth. (Luke 12 : 21, 33; James 6 : 5.) **Ready to distribute**—*free in giving;* opposed to those who, clinging to their wealth, give grudgingly; for "God loveth a cheerful giver." (2 Cor. 9 : 7.) **Willing to communicate**—ready to make others sharers of their earthly good; opposed to such as, without practical sympathy for others' need, are using wealth only for self. See Luke 3 : 11; Gal. 6 : 6; Eph. 4 : 28; Heb. 13 : 16. "Our houses are built, our vineyards are planted, around the base of a volcano. They may be fair and flourishing to-day—to-morrow ashes may be all that remains. Open your hands wide then, while they contain any blessings to bestow; for of that which you give you can never be deprived." (Payson.)

19. Laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come—or, *Laying up for themselves, as a treasure therefrom* (namely, from deeds of benevolence), *a good foundation* (an adequate ground, or basis of expectation) *for the future.* (Prov. 11 : 24, 25; 13 : 17; Luke 6 : 46-49.) Two thoughts are contained in this concise statement: 1. From such deeds of benevolence they are accumulating a treasure; not, in the sense of the Romish Church, a treasure of merit, but, in the sense of Christ (Matt. 6 : 19, 20), a treasure consisting in a holy character formed by the exercise of unselfish and holy dispositions, and in deeds of mercy, which Christ will recognize at the last day as done unto him (Matt. 10 : 42; 25 : 40), and which shall also, of "the mammon of unrighteousness," make friends who will welcome them into "the everlasting habitations" (Luke 16 : 9; Acts 10 : 4). Earthly wealth, thus transmuted into heavenly riches, is gathered as an indestructible treasure awaiting the soul in the future world. 2. This treasure, thus gathered, forms a good foundation in reference to the future. Not the meritorious foundation of a sinner's acceptance with God,—this is always and only the redeeming work of Christ,—but the foundation for the rewards of grace that God has promised

20 O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane *and* vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called:

20 O Timothy, guard [1]that which is committed unto *thee*, turning away from the profane babblings and oppositions of the knowledge which is falsely so

1 Gr. *the deposit.*

to his people. For, although salvation is all of unmerited grace, yet everywhere in Scripture, rewards, temporal and eternal, are promised to Christians as the recompense of holy dispositions exercised and good works done (Mark 10 : 28-30 ; Rev. 2 : 10); and this, because out of a holy character and life flows, as a moral necessity, blessedness here and hereafter; for such a life is in harmony with God's character and government, and all the forces of the universe, therefore, must "work together for good" to him who lives it. (Rom. 8 : 28.) A holy character, fruitful in holy deeds, thus forms 'a good foundation,' both as to the preparation for, and the basis of, a blessed future. (Matt. 7 : 24, 25.) **That they may lay hold on eternal life**—or, *That they may* ("as it were, setting foot on this foundation"), *lay hold on that which is indeed life*, or, *that which is truly life.* The object in treasuring up a good foundation is that thus they may lay hold of, or seize, that which is really life; for it is precisely in exercising these holy, benevolent dispositions that they attain the true life. Holy, beneficent living is the real or eternal life, which thus has its imperfect beginnings here, but will reach its perfection in heaven; and they who thus live, by the holy character they form and the deeds of mercy they work, are laying hold of the real life. Its beginnings here are "a good foundation" for confidence of its completeness there. (Matt. 25 : 21, 29, 34-40; Luke 19 : 17, 26.) "The attainment of a true life is thus the highest end which the rich must seek by the wise and worthy use of his wealth." (Van Oosterzee.) "Whoso builds on the changeable must needs be lost; but whoso builds on the immortal, changeless, God lives in his life, his wealth, and shall share his eternity." (Von Gerlach.) 'Eternal.' Instead of this the best text has *really* (ὄντως), that which is really life; the contrast is thus between selfish, worldly living as not real life, and unselfish, beneficent living as that which is true life, in its proper idea and end. The natural, selfish, worldly man exists, but does not live; only the spiritual, redeemed man, who is like him "who went about doing good," has the real and enduring life. (Ps. 16 : 11.)

20, 21. SOLEMN CLOSING CHARGE TO TIMOTHY, enjoining him to keep the sacred trust of the gospel committed to him, and to avoid those foolish and destructive errors through which some had already turned away from the faith; and closing with the invocation of God's grace on him.

20. O Timothy—an address specially direct and earnest, as introducing the closing exhortation, in which the substance of the Epistle is gathered up and emphasized. **Keep that which is committed to thy trust.** The phrase, 'that which . . . trust,' is one word in the Greek (παραθήκη), and signifies a *deposit* —that which has been deposited with another for safe keeping. Thus 2 Tim. 1 : 12, "He is able to keep *that which I have committed* unto him against that day." Here, as also 2 Tim. 1 : 14, it means the gospel, that "sound doctrine," which had been committed to Timothy to preserve in its purity and to publish to men. Others, as Calvin, De Wette, Huther, regard it as referring to the ministerial office; but it is evident that he is to keep, or guard, this trust by "avoiding" false doctrine, which certainly suggests that the trust referred to is the pure doctrine, the gospel as committed by Christ to the ministry. "'The deposit,' saith he, 'do thou keep.' The talent of the catholic faith preserve thou inviolate and unimpaired. What has been intrusted to thee, let this remain with thee; let this be handed down by thee. Gold thou hast received; gold do thou return." (Vincentius, A. D. 434.) **Avoiding profane and vain babblings and oppositions**—or, "dialectic antitheses." The adjective 'profane' belongs to both nouns. **Of science falsely so called**—or, *Of that which is falsely named knowledge. Knowledge* (Γνῶσις) was one of the spiritual gifts belonging to the apostolic age, by which inspired insight was given by the Holy Spirit into the meaning of Old Testament Scripture and into the profound truths of the gospel. (1 Cor. 1 : 5; 12 : 8; 13 : 2, 8.) Men had already risen professing to possess this *charism*, who only counterfeited it, and whose teaching consisted largely in empty verbiage and artfully-drawn distinctions, relating to subjects of which we

21 Which some professing have erred concerning the faith. Grace *be* with thee. Amen.

21 called; which some professing have [1] erred concerning the faith.
Grace be with you.

1 Gr. *missed the mark.*

can have no actual knowledge. (Col. 2 : 8, 18, 23.) Out of this pretended higher knowledge, or secret wisdom, doubtless arose in the following century the various systems called Gnosticism. Such speculations would naturally find in the semi-oriental population of Ephesus many followers. But from these Timothy is to turn away, and thus keep inviolate and unimpaired the sacred trust committed to him.

21. Which ('science falsely so called') **some professing have erred concerning the faith.** 'Erred'—literally, *missed the mark*, *swerved from.* (1 : 6; 2 Tim. 2 : 18.) Misled by these vain speculations, they had *missed the mark*, had turned away from the truth of the gospel; and the disastrous result of such teachings is held up as a solemn warning to Timothy. **Grace be with thee.** Rather, *The grace* (the well-known grace which God gives) *be with thee.* Some important manuscripts, as the Sinaitic and Alexandrian, read *with you* in the plural, thus including the church in the benediction. This also is the accepted reading of 2 Tim. 4 : 22. **Amen**—a doubtful reading, rejected from the text by most editors.

The subscription to the Epistle—which in the different manuscripts is greatly varied, both in substance and in form—has no claim to genuineness. It was added at a later period, and, in the form found in the Common Version, was appended, probably, on the mistaken supposition that this was "the epistle from Laodicea," referred to in Col. 4 : 16. The Roman province of "Phrygia Pacatiana" was not created till after the fourth century, a fact which shows the late date of this subscription.

INTRODUCTION TO THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

WHEN AND TO WHAT PLACE WRITTEN.

The martyrdom of Paul, as already seen, probably occurred in the summer, A. D. 68. This Epistle was written not long before that event, in a dungeon at Rome, during an interval between his trial before the Imperial Court on the first charge, and his trial on the second, which resulted in his condemnation. The Epistle, therefore, may be dated early in the fall, A. D. 67.

Whether it was addressed to Timothy at Ephesus is uncertain, but several circumstances point strongly to that place. "Alexander the coppersmith" is mentioned (4 : 14), and an Alexander is noticed as put forward by the Jews in the theatre at Ephesus. (Acts 19 : 33.) A Hymeneus is referred to (2 : 17), who may have been the same as the Hymeneus spoke of as at Ephesus. (1 Tim. 1 : 20.) Onesiphorus is mentioned as having ministered to the apostle at Ephesus (1 : 18), while "the household of Onesiphorus" are among those to whom salutations are sent. (4 : 19.) The heretical teachers and their doctrines as presented in this Epistle have a marked similarity to those in the First Epistle, which was certainly addressed to Ephesus. The local notices, in general, agree best with the supposition that Timothy was then in that city ; and the preponderance of judgment among scholars has always favored this view.

OCCASION AND PURPOSE.

The apostle was now a prisoner, held as "a malefactor," and undergoing the nameless horrors of a Roman dungeon ; while in near prospect appeared the end of his course in a martyr's death. He desired, therefore, to see once more this loved and trusted fellow-laborer, and impart, if possible face to face, his dying instructions. Most of his friends and disciples, appalled by the terrors of the Neronian persecution, were scattered from him ; so that, at his first hearing before the Imperial Tribunal, he stood unbefriended and alone. He might well, therefore, like his Lord when about to suffer, feel the need of human sympathy, especially such as the presence of this ever-faithful friend would afford. Hence, he urges Timothy to hasten his coming to Rome ; but lest the disciple should reach the city too late, and he should see him no more on earth, the apostle writes to him special directions and solemn warnings respecting the duties and dangers of the Christian ministry, and charges him to exercise his sacred office with holy self-devotion and unswerving fidelity. To animate him in such a career, he first appeals to Christ's unchanging faithfulness to his faithful servants, as seen in his own case, when he stood before the Imperial Court, where all men forsook "him," nevertheless the Lord stood with "him," and strengthened "him," and then holds up "the crown of life, which the Lord, the Righteous Judge," shall bestow on all who serve him at the last

day. The Epistle, while thus admirably serving its immediate purpose, stands through all the ages as the dying charge of Paul to the Christian ministry, to warn, to guide, and to inspire them in the noblest of earthly vocations.

THE CONTENTS.

This last of the Pauline Epistles, issuing from the dungeon of the aged and worn apostle, is marvelous in the thoughtfulness, tenderness, and wealth of affection that it exhibits; but, like the other, it has no premeditated plan. The topics occur as they welled up in the fruitful mind and large heart of Paul. The following is a general outline.

Chapter First.—Salutation and invocation (1, 2); expression of his gratitude to God for the faith of Timothy (3–5); Timothy is exhorted to a fearless faith in the exercise of his ministry (6–12); admonition to an unswerving adherence to the apostle's doctrine, and fidelity to the ministerial trust (13–18).

Chapter Second.—Necessity of being filled with the power which comes from the grace of Christ (1, 2); exhortation to endure, with Paul, hardship for the gospel, with the manner and motives of such faithful endurance (3–13); directions respecting his spirit and conduct as a Christian teacher, especially in dealing with disturbing and heretical tendencies, believing that, in all changes, the foundation of God stands sure, and the pure gospel shall in the end triumph (14–26).

Chapter Third.—Troublous times predicted in the last days, with a description of those who fall away, and warning against them (1–9); exhortation and motives to steadfastness in these perils, especially from the certainty and fullness of God's word (10–17).

Chapter Fourth.—Solemn charge to fidelity and earnestness in the ministry, especially in view of the imminence of defections from the faith, and of the apostle's removal from earth (1–8); Timothy urged to hasten his coming to Rome, with various directions and warnings (9–15); account of Paul's first defense before the Imperial Court (16–18); various salutations, with the benediction (19–22).

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

CHAPTER I.

PAUL, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, according to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus,
2 To Timothy, *my* dearly beloved son: Grace, mercy, *and* peace, from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord.

1 Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus [1]by the will of God, according to the promise of the life which is in
2 Christ Jesus, to Timothy, my beloved child: Grace, mercy, peace, from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord.

1 Gr. *through.*

Ch. 1 : 1, 2. SALUTATION.—In which, 1. Paul characterizes himself (*a*) as an apostle of Jesus Christ; (*b*) as called to this office by the will of God; and (*c*) as having received it, in order to carry into effect the promise of life which is in Christ. 2. He addresses the Epistle to Timothy, as his dearly beloved son, and invokes on him the threefold blessing of grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus. (See notes on 1 Tim. 1 : 1, on the meaning of 'apostle.') **By** (*or through*) **the will of God.** This divine call to the apostolic office is affirmed in nearly all the epistles, and in some, as Gal. 1 : 1, is emphasized, in order to authenticate the Epistle as of divine authority. Here, as this Epistle was doubtless to be read in the church, the statement of his divine call would not only show the inspired authority of its teaching, but also confirm the authority of Timothy, as the assistant and representative of a divinely called apostle. "In connecting his apostleship here, as so frequently, with God's will, he sought to place it above, not merely any choice or desert of his own, but also every kind of elective agency that was simply human, and to bring it into immediate connection with the mind and purposes of the Supreme." (Fairbairn.) As an apostle, he was the direct medium through which God spoke to men; it was plainly necessary that his appointment should be, not from men, but directly from God. **According to the promise of life**—or, *in pursuance of, or furtherance of.* The divine appointment of Paul to the apostleship was in order to carry into effect, with a view to the fulfillment of, the promise of life. The preposition 'according to' points out the object, or intention, of his divine appointment as an apostle. "So that I might proclaim to men the promised eternal life." (Theodoret.) This is the grand purpose of the ministry; and hence the message they bear to men is called the gospel, *glad tidings*, 'promise of life'; namely, the "eternal life, which God, who cannot lie, promised before the world began." (Titus 1 : 2.) "The promise of life in Christ held out to a dead world thus appears here as the purpose of the apostle's calling." (Wiesinger.) **Which is in Christ Jesus.** This life is in Christ as its source, and as secured to the believer by the work of Christ. (John 11 : 26. 27.) He is "our life." (Col. 3 : 3, 4.) The life is in Christ, not in us, and consequently is not of works, as something we merit, nor as something evolved from within us by personal strivings, but of grace, as something freely flowing forth from him to us, by virtue of his spontaneous, unmerited mercy.

2. To Timothy, my dearly beloved son. In 1 Tim. 1 : 2, he addresses him as "my own," or, *genuine* "child," but here as his *beloved child*, emphasizing his love for him, which perhaps better comports with the circumstances of this Epistle, as written after a most tender and sorrowful parting (4), and in immediate expectation of his martyrdom (4 : 6-8). Love would naturally be the dominant feeling at such a moment. **Grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, and Christ Jesus our Lord.** The common form of invocation in nearly all the epistles, except the inclusion of *mercy*, which is added only in the Pastoral Epistles. See notes on 1 Tim. 1 : 2.

3-5. HIS GRATITUDE TO GOD FOR THE FAITH OF TIMOTHY.—1. He is grateful to God, whom he, after the example of his ancestors, is serving in a pure conscience, 2. He states the circumstances under which his gratitude is awakened; it is while making unceasing remembrance of Timothy in his prayers –

3 I thank God, whom I serve from *my* forefathers with pure conscience, that without ceasing I have remembrance of thee in my prayers night and day;
4 Greatly desiring to see thee, being mindful of thy tears, that I may be filled with joy;
5 When I call to remembrance the unfeigned faith that is in thee, which dwelt first in thy grandmother

3 I thank God, whom I serve from my forefathers in a pure conscience, how unceasing is my remembrance of thee in my supplications, night and day
4 longing to see thee, remembering thy tears, that I
5 may be filled with [1]joy; having been reminded of the unfeigned faith that is in thee; which dwelt first

1 Or, *joy in being reminded.*

a remembrance which is prompted by his longing to see him, that, in their reunion, he may be filled with joy, and is strengthened by the memory of the tears of Timothy at their parting. 3. The occasion that awakens his gratitude is the unfeigned faith of Timothy, of which he had been reminded; which faith had before dwelt in his grandmother Lois, and his mother Eunice, and, the apostle feels assured, dwells in him also.

3, 4. I thank God. Compare on the whole passage Rom. 1:8–12; Eph. 1:16; 1 Thess. 3:9, 10; where, as in other passages, a similar gratitude to God for grace bestowed on others is expressed. **Whom I serve** (*worship*) **from my forefathers;** or, *after the example of my forefathers*; referring probably in 'forefathers' to his more immediate ancestors, as in 1 Tim. 5:4, where the word is used of parents and grandparents. Paul was of a godly ancestry (Acts 23:6, 7), and he declares that the God whom they, as pious Jews, had sincerely worshiped, he also, with like sincerity, is worshiping. In becoming a Christian he has not, as his enemies alleged departed from the God of Israel, the God of his fathers; on the contrary, as he everywhere asserts, he has, in accepting Christ, followed the faith of all the godly Israelites in the past, while his countrymen, in rejecting Christ, have apostatized from the true faith of Israel. (Acts 24:14; Rom. 4:12; 9:31-33; 10:3; 2 Cor. 11:22; Phil. 3:5.) See also the glorious array of the ancient worthies in Heb. ch. 11, who as heroes of faith, are held up as examples, inciting to faith in Christ. **With pure conscience**—marking the ethical sphere in which his service to God was rendered. Not only did he worship the same God as his fathers, but, like them, he worshiped in 'a pure conscience,' with sincerity, honestly, according to the light he had. Throughout the apostle's life, even before his conversion, his religious course had been strictly conscientious He boldly declared before the Sanhedrin, "I have lived in all good conscience before God until this day." (Acts 23:1; Phil. 3:6.) He does, indeed, acknowledge that he was a "blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious"; but in this he did not act in opposition, but rather in strict obedience, to his conscience, for he did it "ignorantly in unbelief." (1 Tim. 1:13; Acts 26:9.) After his conversion, he declared, "I exercise myself to have always a conscience void of offence toward God and toward men." (Acts 24:14-16; 2 Cor. 1:12; Heb. 13:18.) **That without ceasing I have remembrance of thee in my prayers**—marking the circumstances under which the apostle's gratitude is awakened. It is in connection with his prayers, in which there is an unceasing remembrance of Timothy. This fact affords a beautiful inlook into the apostle's habitual life, showing how, as living in the perpetual atmosphere of prayer, he fulfilled his own injunctions, "Pray without ceasing," "Continuing instant in prayer." (1 Thess. 5:17; Rom. 12:12.) His whole life moved in the element of prayer; and in this is found the source of his character, as well as the hiding of his power.

4. Night and day; greatly desiring to see thee, being mindful of thy tears, that I may be filled with joy—better as, for substance, as in the Revised Version: Night and day longing to see thee (remembering thy tears), that I may be filled with joy. His perpetual remembrance of him in prayer is prompted by that warm affection, which leads to a constant longing to see him, that, in the reunion he may be filled with joy; and it is intensified as he recalls the tears of Timothy at their parting. "The longing after Timothy occasions the continual thought of him in the prayers of the apostle, and it is nourished by the recollection of Timothy's tears." (Huther.)

5. When I call to (*having been put in*) **remembrance** (*of*) **the unfeigned faith that is in thee**—or, *having received a reminding of*, etc. "Through some circumstances not further indicated to us, his recollection was aroused touching something indeed which

Lois, and thy mother Eunice; and I am persuaded that in thee also.
6 Wherefore I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands.

in thy grandmother Lois, and thy mother Eunice; 6 and, I am persuaded, in thee also. For the which cause I put thee in remembrance that thou [1] stir up the gift of God, which is in thee through the laying

1 Gr. *stir into flame.*

he knew already, but which now he had observed anew: namely, the unfeigned faith which dwelt in Timothy." (Van Oosterzee.) Thus, also, Wiesinger, Bengel, Ellicott. 'Unfeigned': opposed to an assumed, hypocritical faith. (Phil. 2:22; 1 Tim. 1:5.) **Which** (such as) **dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois, and thy mother Eunice**—that is, the unfeigned faith of Timothy was such as, of like character with, that which had before dwelt in his maternal ancestors. Of Lois we have no other mention, but of the mother, Eunice, it is said, in Acts 16:1, that she was "a Jewess and believed," and, 3:15, that by her maternal care, Timothy "from a child" had "known the holy Scriptures." **And I am persuaded that in thee also**—an unequivocal expression of confidence in the sincerity and reality of Timothy's faith, the conjunction (δέ, but) here being, according to a common Greek usage, appositive in effect, making the words signify: *a faith which, I feel confident, dwells also in thee.* For this confidence respecting Timothy Paul had abundant ground from the character he had shown. (Phil. 2:20.) "Lois and Eunice seem to have 'waited for the consolation of Israel' before they heard the gospel, and thus were prepared to receive it; and having diligently given Timothy a religious education, it greatly conduced to his being made a partaker of the same faith, as the apostle was fully persuaded concerning him." (Scott.) The believing wife had here the influence on the child contemplated in 1 Cor. 7:14; her training, like that of many a faithful Christian mother, was blessed to the conversion of her son, and the example may well inspire to maternal fidelity. While divine grace does not run in the blood, as something transmitted, yet there is a true sense in which moral and spiritual tendencies and characteristics are transmitted; and assuredly, birth from a godly ancestry and childhood life in a Christian home are often most potent factors in the character of the man. All expositors, with Paley, note the coincidence that, in Acts 16:1, the mother only is said to have believed, and here it is her faith, not the father's, which is mentioned.

6-12. Timothy Exhorted to an Active and Fearless Faith in the Exercise of his Ministerial Gift.—To this he is incited: 1. By the nature of the Christian spirit, as imparted by God. It is not cowardly, but fearless. Instead, therefore, of being ashamed of Christ's gospel, and of Paul, imprisoned for Christ's sake, he should rather share in the apostle's hardships, exercising a faith in some degree commensurate with the power of God, exhibited in his salvation. (7, 8.) 2. By the grace of God, in that (*a*) he saved us and called us, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and undeserved favor; (*b*) this grace was given us in Christ before eternal ages, but was manifested by the appearing of Christ, who destroyed the power of death, and through the gospel brought to light life and immortality. (9, 10.) 3. By the example of the apostle himself, who, appointed to the ministerial office, and thereby subjected to suffering, was, nevertheless, not ashamed, since he knew the character of God, whom he had trusted, and was confident of God's ability to keep to the final day the great interests of his soul, which he had committed to him. (11, 12.)

6. Wherefore—that is, because of my confidence in the genuineness of thy faith, as before expressed. (Ver. 5.) **I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up**—*rekindle*, as a fire; or here, perhaps, *kindle up*, as of causing a fire already bright to burn still brighter; "stir it up, as fire under the embers." The same figure is found (1 Thess. 5:19), "Quench not the Spirit," where the Spirit within the soul is compared to a fire, which opposition or neglect may quench. The gift of the Spirit at the Pentecost appeared as a tongue of flame. (Acts 2:3.) **The gift of God**—not the grace received at conversion, but the ministerial gift, including all the gifts for the sacred office, with special emphasis here, perhaps, on boldness in the faith. The thought is not that Timothy had been unfaith-

7 For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.

7 on of my hands. For God gave us not a spirit of fear-
8 fulness; but of power and love and [1]discipline. Be

1 Gr. *sobering.*

ful in the use of this gift, which is forbidden by Paul's thankfulness to God for his faith, expressed in ver. 3–5; but as the apostle himself was soon to die, and weightier responsibilities would thus fall on the disciple. Timothy, instead of timidly shrinking from responsibility, as was, perhaps, natural to him, should rather, with higher courage, make still larger use of his gift, kindling the sacred fire to a higher intensity to meet the duties of this larger sphere. This gift, though imparted by God, would increase or diminish, according as its possessor used it. Ministers may decrease in power by lack of industry, by absorption in other lines of thought and work, or, as was here the danger, by undue timidity and consequent failure in a bold, courageous exercise of their office. Little Faith fails in much that he might have done, and thus, though saved, fails of a full reward. (2 John 8.) On the other hand, the ministerial gift may be re-inflamed, endowed with larger power, by diligence, fidelity, faith, and a fervent and constant exercise of it. "Use gifts, and have gifts; 'to him that hath shall be given.' (Matt. 25 : 29.)" (Henry.) **Which is in thee by** (*through*) **the putting on of my hands.** Three interpretations have here been proposed: 1. That the ministerial gift, defined as the power to minister effectually in preaching the word and administering the sacraments, was imparted by the laying on of Paul's hands, a view which is inconsistent (*a*) with the account of Timothy's separation to the ministry, which implies that his fitness for the office was perceived and was attested by the brethren of Lystra and Iconium before his ordination (Acts 16 : 1-3); (*b*) with the facts also in the other cases of ordination, in both of which the gifts existed before the ordination, and their existence constituted the reason for ordaining them to the work (Acts 6 : 6; 13 : 3); and (*c*) with the plain directions to Timothy and Titus, which require that the requisite qualifications be found in candidates before they are placed in office. (1 Tim. 3 : 1-7; 5 : 22; Titus 1 : 5-9.) 2. That the expression here indicates not the conferring of any gift by the imposition of Paul's hands, but only the public recognition of Timothy's ministerial gift by Paul and the elders, a view which, while adequately explaining 1 Tim. 4 : 14, where the gift was given "through prophecy, *with* the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," does not adequately interpret this passage, where the gift is said to be in him *through*, or *by means of* (διά) the laying on of the apostle's hands—language which makes the imposition of Paul's hands, in some sense, the medium of conveying the gift. 3. That a gift for the ministry already existed in Timothy, but, through the laying on of an apostle's hands, this natural gift was exalted into a *charism*, or gift of the Holy Spirit, intensifying and enlarging this natural qualification. (Acts 8 : 15-19.) This seems to me a fair interpretation of the words. According to this, the ordination of Timothy was attended with exceptional circumstances; for, when he was ordained, a distinct prophetic utterance designated him, as it had Barnabas and Saul, for the office; and Paul, as an apostle, united with the presbytery in the laying on of hands, so that he, through the imposition of an apostle's hands, received the supernatural gift of the Holy Spirit. Plainly, this cannot occur now, since there are neither prophets nor apostles in the church, and the *charisms* of the Spirit have ceased.

7. For—introducing an argument for stirring up his gift, and against that timidity which here, as elsewhere, is intimated as a natural characteristic of Timothy. Such timidity, the apostle urges, is not of God, and is to be resisted. **God hath not given** (*did not give*) **us the spirit of fear**—a spirit which shrinks from duty and responsibility in the presence of toil or danger. Fear is often a fatal snare. The wicked servant said: "I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth." (Matt. 25 : 25.) But it is the nature of true religion to inspire a courageous faith and lift the soul above fear. (Acts 4 : 13.) In all ages it has made the timid bold and nerved the fearful with courage and strength. **But of power**—the opposite of weakness in timidity. The Holy Spirit is designated as "power from on high," and his presence has always given power, es-

8 Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner: but be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel according to the power of God;
9 Who hath saved us, and called *us* with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began;

not ashamed therefore of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner: but suffer hardship with
9 the gospel according to the power of God; who saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ

pecially a holy boldness in uttering the truth. (Luke 24:49; Acts 4:31.) **And of love**—that self-forgetting love to Christ, to the church, and to the souls of men, which exhorts, warns, rebukes with boldness and fidelity at whatever risk of consequences to self. **And of a sound mind** (*self-control*) — a self-control which restrains and gives calmness in danger. "The power of authoritative control and wise restraint, which, if we have but in sufficient measure, we shall not weakly bend to adverse circumstances, but make them bend to us." (Fairbairn.) Thus Wiesinger, Ellicott, Van Oosterzee. Others translate either *correction*, as Alford and Huther; or, *chastisement*, as Conant, referring, in both cases, to decision and authority in the enforcement of discipline.

8. Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord. Since God has given us such a spirit, be not timid, fearful, ashamed to bear testimony to our Lord—that is, to the gospel in all its doctrines and precepts and promises, of which Christ our Lord is the centre and the substance. (Acts 1:8.) **Nor of me his prisoner**—a prisoner for his sake. Be not ashamed of me, who am imprisoned for Christ's sake, in failing either boldly to declare my apostolic authority and doctrine in Ephesus and Asia, or to come to Rome and identify thyself with me in my poverty and bonds. Some were ashamed, and had forsaken him in his great peril (4:10, 16), and the apostle was anxious that, amid this sad defection of others in the hour of danger, Timothy should prove faithful to Christ and his persecuted servant. There is no evidence here that Timothy had shown a lack of faith—the thanksgiving to God for his faith proves the reverse; but in the defection of many whom he had trusted, and in the near approach of the apostle's death, it was natural for him to be solicitous to strengthen the spirit of Timothy. **But be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel**—or, *Suffer hardship with me for the gospel.* "Not suffer with the gospel, bear with it the disgrace attached to it, but suffer *with me*, who also am suffering for the gospel." (Van Oosterzee.) Thus most expositors. **According to the power of God**—that is, according to the power God has displayed in the work of our redemption, described in verses 9, 10. Let thy willingness to suffer for God be in some proportion to the power he has shown in the gospel to save thee. "He points to the great things done by God in the matter of our salvation as a ground and motive for something corresponding being done by us." (Fairbairn.) Others, as Chrysostom: "Think not that thou hast to bear these afflictions by thine own power; nay, it is by the power of God."

9. Who hath saved us. As a reason for enduring suffering 'according to the power of God,' he shows the greatness of God's grace and power as displayed in our salvation. The passage is characteristically Pauline in thought and expression. 'Who'—God the Father—'saved us'; namely, all believers. "He who has experienced the power of God in his own salvation and calling must not, in view of this power, shrink from sufferings; with an answering confidence he must be ready to suffer for the gospel." (Wiesinger.) **And called us with a holy calling.** It is God the Father who effectually calls his people. (Rom. 8:30; Eph. 1:18); and the vocation to which he calls them is also *holy*. The calling is an exercise of his holiness, and it leads to holiness in us. (Eph 4:1; Col. 1:10; 1 Peter 1:15.) "The call comes wholly from God, and claims us wholly for God. 'Holy' implies the separation of believers from the rest of the world unto God." (Fausset.) **Not according to our works.** Our works were neither the consideration for which, nor the standard according to which, he saved and called us. Elsewhere he said: "By grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast." (Eph. 2:8, 9.) "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us." (Titus 3:5.) "The origin of it is the free grace

10 But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel:

10 Jesus before times eternal, but hath now been manifested by the appearing of our Saviour Christ Jesus, who abolished death, and brought life and [1] immortality

1 Gr. *incorruption.*

and eternal purpose of God in Christ Jesus. If we had merited it, it had been hard to suffer for it; but our salvation by it is of free grace, and therefore we must not think much to suffer for it." (Henry.) **But according to his own purpose and grace.** 'His own' is here emphatic. He was self-moved, impelled by motives, not from without, but from within, himself. His design of mercy was called forth by no desert, no worthiness in us; but it was "according to his good pleasure, which he purposed in himself"; "according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." (Eph. 1 : 9, 11.) 'Grace'—free, unmerited favor—a favor, the grounds of which are in him who bestows, not in him who receives. **Which** (grace) **was given to us in Christ Jesus before the world began**—or, *before eternal times.* The grace was given to us believers—although we did not then personally exist—in Christ, as our Redeemer and Representative. The thought is elsewhere expressed: "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love; having predestinated us unto the adoption of children to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will." (Eph. 1 : 4, 5; 1 Peter 1 : 2.) Christ and his body, the church, are one and indivisible in the divine mind, and grace was given to the chosen, therefore, when in eternity they were chosen in him. "'Which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.' It is a gift, and a free gift, not at all depending upon any conditions of the creature, and entirely proceeding from the sovereign will of God; and it was a gift from eternity; there was not only a purpose of grace in God's heart, and a promise of it so early, but there was a real donation of it in eternity; and though those to whom it was given did not then personally exist, yet Christ did, and he existed as a Covenant Head and Representative of his people; and they were in him, as members of him, as represented by him, being united to him; and this grace was given to him for them, and to them in him; in whom they were chosen, and in whom they were blessed with all spiritual blessings." (Gill.) 'Before eternal times'—that is, prior to the series of ages during which the universe has existed; or, as elsewhere expressed, "before the foundation of the world." Compare Rom. 16 : 25; Titus 1 : 2; also 1 Cor. 2 : 7; Eph. 3 : 11. This grace was, in the divine purpose, given in Christ to believers prior to the creation, before time began; and "what God determines in eternity is as good as already made actual in time." (De Wette.)

10. But—the purpose of grace, thus formed in eternity, was realized, unfolded in time. **Is now made manifest.** This grace, which was given in Christ before time began, but had been hidden during all the ages, was now, at the epoch of the incarnation, manifested. (Rom. 16 : 25, 26; Col. 1 : 26.) **By the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ**—his appearing in the flesh referring, not to his birth only, but to his whole manifestation, in his life, death, and resurrection. This manifestation of God in our humanity disclosed the grace which had hitherto been hidden. **Who hath abolished death**—or, *in that he made death, indeed, of no effect.* He "took away the power from death." (Tittman.) Compare 1 Cor. 15 : 26; Heb. 2 : 14. "Death appears here, as also elsewhere (for example, Rom. 6 : 23), not as strictly bodily or spiritual death ('dead in trespasses,' Col. 2 : 13), but the power which, in consequence of sin, has seized alike on body and soul, and inflicts natural, as the precursor of eternal, death. Its sting is sin; it is nullified when this is taken away, for it is then no longer a denial of life and immortality. There remains but the form of death, until this also is annihilated and death is no more (Rev. 21 : 4: death shall exist no more, etc.)." (Wiesinger.) This death he abolished, or made of no effect: 1. By the new spiritual life he imparts to those who believe on him, through which sin the "sting" of death is destroyed (Eph. 2 : 1); and as the result of which the act of dying is to the Christian no longer death, but only the passing into a new and higher life with Christ. (John 11 : 26; Rom. 8 : 2, 38; 2 Cor. 5 : 6-8; Heb. 2 : 14.) 2. By his own triumph over

11 Whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles.
12 For the which cause I also suffer these things: nevertheless I am not ashamed; for I know whom I

11 tality to light through the gospel, whereunto I was ap-
12 pointed a [1]preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher. For the which cause I suffer also these things: yet I am not ashamed; for I know him whom I have believed,

1 Gr. *herald.*

death in his resurrection and glorification, which was the type and pledge of a like triumph of his people, when they also shall rise in his image, with bodies made like unto his glorious body, and "there shall be no more death." (1 Cor. 15 : 26, 50-57; Phil. 3 : 21.) The destruction of death, which is accomplished in Christ the Head, is here spoken of as if already accomplished in his Body, the church. (Col. 3 : 3, 4.) **And hath brought life and immortality to light**—or, *revealed, by throwing light thereon, life and incorruption.* Before obscure, hidden amid shadows, his appearing illumined them. Compare 1 Cor. 4 : 5. 'Life and immortality,' or, the incorruptible, imperishable life, had been, indeed, already adumbrated in the Old Testament; but Christ, in his teachings, and especially in his life, death, resurrection, and glorification, lighted up, illumined, what was before only dimly seen, and brought it forth, as into the blaze of the noonday sun. The full meaning of life and immortality is seen only in Christ, as now he, the God-Man, sits glorified on the throne of the universe. 'Life' is here the new spiritual life imparted by "the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," when the soul, before "dead in trespasses and sins," is quickened (Rom. 8 : 2, 6; Eph 2 : 1); and the indwelling of "the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead" within the believer is the pledge of the ultimate resurrection and incorruption of his body. (Rom. 8 : 10, 11.) 'Immortality,' or imperishability, is an attribute of the 'life' which, already existing in the Christian, shall at last pervade and possess his whole nature, body and soul. (Rom. 2 : 7; 1 Peter 1 : 4.) The work of Christ, at his appearing on earth, is thus expressed in its grandest manifestation of power. On the one hand, it destroyed death, the fearful penalty of sin, in all its effects, alike in the soul and the body; on the other, it revealed life, in all the fullness of its blessing, permeating, enriching, ennobling the whole being, spiritual and bodily, and at last transforming the man, in his whole nature, into the likeness of the glorified God-Man. "Death results from the falling away of the creature from God, and in its development includes in itself moral weakness (ἀσθένεια), corruption (διαφθορά), and the endless ruin (ἀπώλεια) of soul and body. *This death process Christ has made of no effect by the interposed life process*, first of all in his own person, then, as a result therefrom, in those who personally unite themselves with him." (Beck.) **Through the gospel** — the instrument through which, as Christ is the agent by whom, 'life and immortality' are brought to light, or revealed to man.

11. Whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles. Compare 1 Tim. 2 : 7. where the same expression is used. There, however, it is connected with the assertion of his authority in the gospel, but here with a statement of the sufferings endured in preaching the gospel. 'Of the Gentiles'—omitted in the Sinaitic and Alexandrian manuscripts, as well as in Cursive 17, and in Revised Version; but probably to be retained, as sustained by all other manuscript authority [ℵ^c C D E F G K L P, Syriac, Coptic, etc.—A. H.], and as here important to the sense.

12. For the which cause—that is, because I was appointed to this office, and am fulfilling it, especially as an apostle to the Gentiles. (Acts 22 : 21; Eph. 3 : 1.) **I also suffer these things;** namely, the suffering connected with his persecution and imprisonment. (Ver. 8, 15.) It was the very calling he had received from God as an apostle to the Gentiles, which proved the occasion of his sufferings. **Nevertheless I am not ashamed.** Though thus suffering, he had lost none of his boldness in proclaiming Christ and his gospel; and he cites his own example, in order to awaken in Timothy like courage and endurance for the Master. (Ver. 8.) **For I know whom I have believed**—or, *on whom I have fixed my trust.* The reason he is not ashamed, he knows God his Saviour, God in Christ, whom he has trusted; and this knowledge frees him from all doubt and fear. "I know what a faithful, promise-keeping God he is. (2 : 13.) It is not, I know how I have believed, but I know

have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.
13 Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus.
14 That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us.

and I am persuaded that he is able to guard [1] that which I have committed unto him against that day.
13 Hold the pattern of [2] sound words which thou hast heard from me, in faith and love which is in Christ
14 Jesus. [3] That good thing which was committed unto *thee* guard through the Holy Spirit who dwelleth in us.

1 Or, *that which he hath committed unto me.* Gr. *my deposit*.....2 Gr. *healthful*.....3 Gr. *The good deposit.*

WHOM I have believed—a feeble faith may clasp a strong Saviour." (Fausset.) The character of God, especially as he is revealed in Christ, is the ultimate ground of Christian trust; and the more perfectly that character is apprehended in any soul, the more absolute and complete will be its reliance on him and its rest in him. (1 Sam. 30 : 6; Hab. 3 : 17, 18; Rom. 5 : 11.) **And am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him**—literally, *my deposit* (*την παραθήκην μου*). Paul had committed to God in Christ his whole being, body, soul, and spirit, with all his interests for time and eternity. God is here the trustee with whom he has deposited for safe keeping his temporal and eternal salvation and welfare; and the ground of his confidence is the omnipotence of God. He is able to keep it. "God deposits with us his word, we deposit with God our spirit." (Grotius.) (Luke 23 : 46; 1 Thess. 5 : 23; 1 Peter 4 : 19.) Thus most interpreters. Some, however, interpret the "deposit" as the "office of preaching the gospel," which God had committed to Paul, as ver. 14; an interpretation less congruous with the context, in which he is speaking of the trust he himself has reposed in God, and one which is by no means required by ver. 14, since *deposit* (*παραθήκη*) is a general term, and need not designate the same deposit in both places. **Against that day**—the final day, the day of judgment, when "the righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." Not simply *until that day*, but *unto, with reference to, for* that day. What has thus been intrusted will be kept safe, unimpaired, for the needs and the blessedness of that day. (4 : 8; Matt. 13 : 43; Rom. 8 : 18-23; 2 Thess. 1 : 6-10; James 1 : 12.)

13-18. ADMONITION TO AN UNSWERVING ADHERENCE TO THE APOSTLE'S DOCTRINE, AND FIDELITY TO THE MINISTERIAL TRUST. —1. Timothy is urged to hold the health-giving doctrine of the gospel, as received from the apostle, in the faith and love of Christ, and to guard, by means of the indwelling Spirit, the sacred trust of the ministry. (13, 14.) 2. This admonition is enforced (*a*) by way of warning, in that certain Asiatics, when at Rome, had turned away from the apostle, especially Phygellus and Hermogenes; and, by way of encouragement, in the example of Onesiphorus, who, regardless of danger, had sought him out and cheered him in his prison; for which mercy shown to the apostle, he invokes God's mercy on him at the final day. (15–18.)

13. Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. The word translated in the Common Version *form* (*ὑποτύπωσις*) is rendered (1 Tim. 1 : 16) *pattern*, designating that which was intended as a model, exemplar. It refers here to the instruction, the general system of truth which Timothy had received from Paul; not, however, as a mere dead form of words, but "as a living expression of things, as if they were visibly presented to the eye." (Calvin.) This living outline of truth, taught, not in words of man's wisdom, but in the wholesome, health-imparting words of the Spirit, and imprinted as an image on the mind of Timothy, he is to hold there, alike in substance and form, uneffaced and undistorted by "questions and strifes of words." "What St. Paul had delivered to Timothy was to be to him a pattern and exemplar to guide him." (Ellicott.) 'In faith and love'—the sphere, or element, in which he is to hold this system of truth. It is to be held, not barely in the reason, as if only an intellectual conception, but rather in the heart, as an object of faith and love, and that the love which is inspired by Christ Jesus. His theology is to be the theology of the heart, vitalized and spiritualized in the atmosphere of Christian faith and love. The truths of the gospel are clearly apprehended and firmly held only as they live and glow in the heart. (1 Tim. 5 : 5, 6, 19.)

15 This thou knowest, that all they which are in Asia be turned away from me; of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes.
16 The Lord give mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus; for he oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain:

15 This thou knowest, that all that are in Asia turned away from me; of whom are Phygelus and
16 Hermogenes. The Lord grant mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus: for he oft refreshed me, and

14. That good thing which was committed unto thee—or, *that excellent deposit.* The same word as in ver. 12, "that which I have committed unto him"; but there it denotes a deposit intrusted by Paul to God—his soul, with all its priceless interests; while here it is a deposit intrusted by God to Timothy—the everlasting gospel, with all its precious promises and hopes for men. The exhortation is, then, that he guard or keep sacredly that priceless trust by holding the gospel in its purity and proclaiming it with all fidelity.

Keep by (*means of*) **the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us.** This sacred deposit he is to guard, not by his own power, but by the power of the Holy Spirit, who dwells in all believers and who alone can enable the Christian minister to guard this holy trust of the gospel. The indwelling Spirit is everywhere represented as the source of spiritual life and power. See Zech. 4 : 6; Luke 12 : 12; John 14 : 17, 26; Acts 1 : 8; 4 : 31; Rom. 8 : 26; 1 Cor. 12 : 7–10; Gal. 5 : 22, 23; Eph. 3 : 16. "As if he had said, I do not ask from thee more than thou canst; for what thou hast not from thyself the Spirit of God will supply to thee." (Calvin.) "What Paul says of the Holy Ghost as *indwelling* within the believer, refers us to the highest blessing of the New Covenant, in which the Holy Ghost is the immanent, vital principle of all the redeemed. During the Old Covenant, he overshadowed momentarily individual, holy men of God; in the New, he abides perpetually in the heart of each Christian." (Van Oosterzee.)

15. This thou knowest that all they which are in Asia be turned away from me. Who these persons were we have no means of knowing, but probably they were Christians from Proconsular Asia, who had come to Rome, but, terrified by the peril in which Paul stood, had avoided him, shrinking from recognition as his disciples and friends, and leaving him in his prison unvisited and uncomforted, lest they also should come under persecution. This neglect of him in his bonds was, doubtless, all the more keenly felt by the apostle, since some of them were probably converted under his ministry when in Asia. It has been supposed that they came to Rome as witnesses in Paul's behalf on the trial; but, appalled by the danger in which he stood, had refused to appear and testify before the Imperial Court. Such a fact is touchingly alluded to by Paul. (4 : 16.) Their desertion of him was already, in some way, known to Timothy; but the apostle mentions it, as well as the noble fidelity of Onesiphorus, as an incentive to fidelity in Timothy, and especially as a cogent reason for hastening his coming to Rome to the help of his aged, but now deserted, father in the gospel. 'Asia' designates the Roman province of that name on the western coast of Asia Minor, which included Mysia, Phrygia, Lydia, and Caria. **Of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes**—mentioned by name, either because more prominent than the rest and better known to Timothy, or because their relations to the apostle were of a special character, rendering their desertion of him a more aggravated offense. We have no other mention of them.

16. The Lord give mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus. In contrast with those of Asia, he now presents, as an incentive to Timothy, the noble conduct of Onesiphorus, a resident of Ephesus (4 : 19), who, when at Rome, instead of shrinking from the danger, had taken special pains to find the apostle and extend practical sympathy. **For he oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain.** He had with all courage brought comfort of mind and body to the apostle in his prison, and this, not once only, but *often.* "Next to suffering for the sake of the gospel, the grandest thing is to support the persecuted against the world, to incur danger for them, as Jerome for Huss, as Frederick the Wise for Luther. Jesus recognizes that as done unto himself. (Matt. 19 : 40, 41.)" (Heubner.) See Heb. 10 : 32–34. 'My chain' may indicate that Paul—in this second imprisonment, as in the first—was bound to a soldier by a chain. (Acts 28 : 20; Eph. 6 : 20.)

17 But, when he was in Rome, he sought me out very diligently, and found *me*.
18 The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day: and in how many things he ministered unto me at Ephesus, thou knowest very well.

17 was not ashamed of my chain; but, when he was in
18 Rome he sought me diligently, and found me (the Lord grant unto him to find mercy of the Lord in that day); and in how many things he ministered at Ephesus, thou knowest very well.

CHAPTER II.

THOU therefore, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus.

1 Thou therefore, my child, be strengthened in the

17. But when he was in Rome, he sought me out very diligently, and found me. Among the multitude of prisoners at Rome from all parts of the empire, it might be no easy task to find Paul; but Onesiphorus persisted in the search till he found him, although the hazard of such a search and of identifying himself with such a prisoner must have been extreme, during this fearful persecution of Christians in the last days of Nero. The fact that it was not easy to find Paul shows that this is a different imprisonment from that described in Acts 28:30, when he "dwelt in his own hired house, and received all that came to him, preaching the kingdom of God . . . . no man forbidding him"; for then he must have been known to all the Jews in Rome, as well as to many others. 'Very diligently'; the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, have here, not the camparative, but (σπουδαίως), *diligently*, *zealously*, which is probably the true reading.

18. The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day. 'The Lord grant' had doubtless already become a formula of invocation; hence the repetition of Lord in immediate connection. The kindness which the aged and imprisoned apostle himself could never repay, he asks that the Lord may reward by bestowing mercy on his faithful friend in the day of judgment, in accordance with Matt. 5:7; 10:42; 25:34–40; for he was indeed "sick and in prison," and Onesiphorus "visited" him. Roman interpreters, from the mention of "the house of Onesiphorus" (ver. 16; 4:19) have inferred that he was not himself living at the time this Epistle was written, and have used this passage as an argument for prayers in behalf of the dead. But the assumption of Onesiphorus' death is wholly gratuitous; the utmost that can legitimately be inferred from the absence of salutation to him is that Paul, knowing the plans of Onesiphorus' journey, did not suppose that he would have reached Ephesus at the time this Epistle was received, and therefore sent salutation to his household rather than to him. In any case the prayer does not ask deliverance from purgatory, as Romish prayers for the dead, but that "he may find mercy of the Lord in that day," the day of final Judgment. "This prayer shows how much richer a recompense awaits those who, without expectation of earthly reward, perform kind offices to the saints, than if they received it immediately from the hand of men." (Calvin.) **And in how many things he ministered unto me at Ephesus thou knowest very well.** The Greek has the comparative *better*, not the positive. (See Winer's New Testament Grammar, section 35,4, Thayer's edition.) The thought is not barely of the personal service rendered by him to Paul at Ephesus; but, in general, of the service he had done the Christian cause there, of which Timothy from his residence there had even better knowledge than the apostle himself. What Onesiphorus had done for Paul at Rome was, therefore, only one instance in a life marked throughout by deeds of self-sacrificing faith and love. 'Unto me,' in the English and Latin versions, but wanting in the Greek; the expression, therefore, indicates the general kindness and beneficence of his conduct in the church.

Ch. 2: This chapter is filled with exhortations and counsels founded on the preceding exhibition of Timothy's duties and dangers, and adapted to incite him to courage and fidelity in his ministerial office.

1, 2. NECESSITY OF BEING FILLED WITH POWER BY THE GRACE IN CHRIST—especially in view of the duty of the ministry to transmit the gospel unimpaired to faithful men who shall be competent to teach others also. **Thou, therefore, my son** (child), **be strong.** In view of the above examples (1:11-18) as warned, on the one hand, by the

2 And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.

2 grace that is in Christ Jesus. And the things which thou hast heard from me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be

defection of all them "that are in Asia," and as inspired, on the other, by the faith and courage of Paul and the fidelity of Onesiphorus, be *thou* strengthened, or filled with power, that thou mayest be faithful. Not, 'be strong,' but either the passive voice, *be strengthened*, or the middle, *strengthen thyself*. Compare 1 : 7. God has given us the spirit of *power*. (Rom. 4 : 20; Eph. 6 : 10.) The manner in which this strength is to be obtained is set forth. (Eph. 6 : 11-20.) **In the grace**—grace is here the insphering element, the spiritual atmosphere, in which the Christian soul exists, and from which, as a vitalizing principle, the soul derives strength. He is to find strength, to be filled with power for work and conflict, by drawing it from the grace in Christ, the quickening, empowering element in which a Christian lives. (2 Peter 3 : 18.) "Grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." **Which is in Christ Jesus**—the grace which is only in him, and which he imparts to all who are in living union with him, as the vine imparts the life and fruit-power to the branches abiding in it. (John 15 : 4, 5.) Being '*strong* in the grace that is in Christ Jesus' may be understood—1. In opposition to the weakness of grace. Where there is the truth of grace, there must be a laboring after the strength of grace. As our trials increase, we have need to grow stronger and stronger in that which is good; our faith stronger, our resolution stronger, our love to God and Christ stronger. 2. In opposition to our being strong in our own strength. 'Be strong, not confiding in thy own sufficiency, but in the grace that is in Christ Jesus.' Compare Eph. 6 : 10. "'Be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might.' When Peter promised to die for Christ rather than deny him, he was strong in his own strength; had he been strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus, he had kept his standing better." (Henry.)

And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses. The 'witnesses' here are probably the elders and others who were present at Timothy's ordination, and who listened to, and participated in, Paul's solemn charge, in committing to him the gospel and the ministerial office. The 'things heard' are the fundamental truths of the gospel, an outline of which, it is possible, Paul presented on that occasion. (1 : 13.) Thus most interpreters. Others refer 'witnesses' to the believing multitudes who, with Timothy, had at different times listened to Paul's preaching, and who by their faith had attested the truth of the doctrines proclaimed. Thus Van Oosterzee, Fairbairn, Conybeare. In any case, the word 'witnesses' implies that those thus designated concurred in the things spoken by Paul, in such sense that their very presence was an impressive attestation and emphasis of them. **The same commit thou**—or, *these deliver thou in trust*, as a precious deposit. (1 : 14.) **To faithful men**—not only believing, but faithful men—men worthy of the trust. **Who** (*such as*) **shall be able to teach others also**—that is, teach other faithful, or trustworthy men, who in turn shall be put in trust with the gospel. The thought is, that from age to age, in accordance with Eph. 1 : 14, Christ will raise up and qualify men for the ministerial office, to whom the gospel is to be handed down unimpaired, "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." 'The true keeping of the deposit entrusted to thee will involve thy handing it on unimpaired to others, who may in their turn hand it on again. But in order to this, thou must be strong in grace; thou must be a fellow-sufferer with me in hardships: thou must strive lawfully; thou must not be entangled in life's matters." (Alford.) Thus, also, De Wette, Wiesinger, Huther, Fairbairn. Other interpreters, as Van Oosterzee and Whitby, understand 'others' of the congregation, not of ministers.

Two things are here to be observed: 1. The marks of a true ministry, as here presented, do not consist in an outward succession from the apostles, and the imposition of a bishop's hands. On the contrary, they are found: (*a*) In the character of the men; they must be *faithful*, personally worthy of the high trust. (*b*) In what they preach; this must be the true, apostolic gospel, as taught by the apostle himself, and committed to Timothy to preach to others. (*c*) In their competency

3 Thou therefore endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.
4 No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of *this* life; that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier.

3 able to teach others also. [1]Suffer hardship with *me*, 4 as a good soldier of Christ Jesus. No soldier on service entangleth himself in the affairs of *this* life; that he may please him who enrolled him as a sol-

1 Or, *Take thy part in suffering hardship, as, etc.*

for the work; they must be *able to teach others*. 2. The ministry have a distinct and solemn responsibility in the ordination of a minister. In setting apart to the sacred office, it is their duty to ascertain that the candidate proposed is *faithful*, possessing a character such as makes him worthy of the trust, that he holds the pure gospel as it is taught in Scripture, and that he has such ability and training as render him competent to teach this gospel to others. The selection of men for the pastoral office, does, indeed, belong to each church, as a congregation of believers; but if the men thus selected and presented for ordination are wanting in any of these fundamental qualifications, it is the plain duty of the presbytery to refuse to ordain. For, as ministers, made responsible for the transmission of a pure gospel to a pure and competent ministry, they are charged to 'commit the things,' the apostolic doctrines, only to 'faithful men,' such as shall be 'able to teach others also.' In the absence of these essential requisites in the candidate, the presbytery has no right to set a man apart to the sacred office, but is under solemn obligation to refuse to sanction his entrance on it. The Lord has thus doubly guarded the ministry from the intrusion of unworthy, heretical, or incompetent men, by requiring in church officers not only that they be selected by an act of the church as a congregation, but also that they be approved and set apart by an act of the presbytery. For the apostles, in the appointment of the seven, gave direction to "the multitude of the disciples": "Look *ye* out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom *we* may appoint over this business." (Acts 6 : 1-6.) This principle of appointment to office—election by the people, setting apart by the ministry—was ordinarily observed in the apostolic churches; in which, therefore, the ultimate responsibility of admitting to the ministerial office plainly devolved on the ministry itself. (Acts 13 : 1-3; 14-23; 1 Tim. 4 : 14; 5 : 22; Titus 1 : 5.) As at that period every church seems to have had a plurality of elders, it had its own "presbytery," and thus it possessed within itself the full powers necessary for instituting and perpetuating its own ministry.

3-13. Exhortation to Endure with Paul Hardship for the Gospel, with a Statement of the Spirit and Motives with which It Should be Endured.

I. **3-7.** Illustrations of the Spirit in which such Hardship is to be Met.—1. With unreserved devotion to Christ, as the soldier, who devotes himself wholly to the cause of him by whom he was enrolled. 2. With unshrinking obedience to every duty, as the athlete, who contends in the games, shrinks from no requirement of the rules, however severe or painful, that he may win the crown. 3. With undiscouraged and unsparing toil, as the husbandman, who, through persistent toil, secures the first participation of the fruits in harvest. These illustrations, Timothy is exhorted to consider, assured that the Lord will give him understanding in all things.

3. Thou therefore endure hardness—or, as the Revised Version, *suffer hardship with me;* or, *take thy share in suffering.* He is not to shrink from the sufferings which must needs meet all faithful ministers, and which especially met the apostle himself. (1 Tim. 1 : 18; 6 : 12.) 'Thou therefore'—in the Common Version, but not found in the Sinaitic, Alexandrian, Ephraem, and other ancient codices. **As a good soldier of Jesus Christ.** This figure, presenting the Christian as a soldier, is one common with the apostle. See 1 Cor. 9 : 7; 2 Cor. 10 : 3-6; Eph. 6 : 10-20.

4. No man that warreth (*no soldier when on service*) **entangleth himself with the affairs of this life**—that is, with the business affairs of ordinary life. The Roman soldier was expressly restrained from this by the rules of the army. In applying the figure, however, we may not infer that the minister is forbidden to use a secular calling as a means of support, if need be; for Paul wrought as a tent maker. But he is to avoid absorption in

5 And if a man also strive for masteries, *yet* is he not crowned, except he strive lawfully.
6 The husbandman that laboureth must be first partaker of the fruits.
7 Consider what I say; and the Lord give thee understanding in all things.

5 dier. And if also a man contend in the games, he is not crowned, except he have contended lawfully.
6 The husbandman that laboureth must be the first to
7 partake of the fruits. Consider what I say; for the Lord shall give thee understanding in all things.

it, or complications in connection with it, such as may divert him in spirit from his higher, divine calling. It is not a secular occupation, but entanglement in it, which is forbidden. (1 Cor. 7 : 32.) Paul wrought in an earthly occupation, but his whole soul was absorbed in the one work of proclaiming Christ; the secular was incidental, only a means to the higher end. (Acts 20 : 24, 31-35.) 'Entangleth.' (2 eter 2 : 20.) **That he may please him who hath chosen him to be** (*enrolled him as*) **a soldier.** The merely personal will and private interest of the soldier yield, in an absolute devotement, to the will and interest of the commander. In such a spirit should the minister conduct his life, with no separate, personal interest, but with absolute self-devotement to the will and service of Christ, seeking only to please him. (1 Thess. 2 : 4.)

5. And if a man also strive for masteries—or, *if also any athlete contend in the games:* referring to the well-known athletic contests in the Grecian games. (1 Cor. 9 : 24-27; Heb. 12 : 1.) **Yet is he not crowned, except he strive lawfully**—that is, *according to the rules.* The rules of the games prescribed the time and manner of preparation, as well as the things to be observed in the contest itself; and these requirements taxed to the utmost the endurance and strength of the contestant, alike in the preparation and the struggle. He must be "temperate in all things," and "keep his body under and bring it into subjection." All this was cheerfully endured, in view of the prize, the crown which was thereby to be won. The minister of Christ, in like manner, is not to shrink from the hardships appointed in his course, but to endure them with all fortitude, in view of the crown of life at the end; since only through the endurance of the appointed toil and sufferings will that crown be won. (4 : 7, 8.) "We may not dispense ourselves from this or that requirement of our vocation, nor fail, in conformity to our inclination, to encounter any peril or danger which it imposes; neither pleasure nor convenience must be our adviser, if we would win the crown." (Wiesinger.)

6. The husbandman that laboureth (*is he that*) **must be first partaker of the fruits**—that is, not he who, discouraged, has ceased to labor, but he who is laboriously at work in the field will be first in sharing the fruits at harvest. To him, as persistently toiling for the crop, belong, according to a fixed law of nature, the first, highest results of toil. So thou, the apostle would say, steadfastly laboring in preparing the soil and sowing the seed, wilt at the harvest, according to an assured law of God's kingdom, be first to partake of the glorious results; and not only wilt thou see a harvest at the end, but thou shalt be the richest partaker of it, since it is precisely the present toil and suffering which give capacity and meetness for the coming blessedness and glory. (Luke 19 : 17, 26; James 5 : 7.) "The right of first participation in the harvest belongs to him who is laboring in the field; do not thou, therefore, by relaxing this labor, forfeit that right." (Alford.)

7. Consider what I say—that is, seek to apprehend the true significance of these illustrations; enter into their real meaning. **And** (*for*) **the Lord** (*will*) **give thee understanding in all things.** The encouragement to seek an apprehension of the truth is that he need not depend on his own imperfect, erring faculties, but shall have the promised guidance of the Lord. (John 14 : 26; 16 : 13.) "To collect the sum of these illustrations: 'Do thou take thy share with me in suffering; it is the law and condition of success. The soldier on duty must deny himself all the advantages and endearments of civil and domestic life; the athlete in the games must not hope for the crown, unless he observes the stern laws of the training and the contest; that husbandman only who has endured the toil has a right to share the fruits.'" (Bible Com.) *For the Lord will give*—the reading found in the best manuscripts. [ℵ A C* D E F G, etc.—A. H.]

II. **8-13.** INCENTIVES TO THE ENDURING OF SUCH HARDSHIPS.—1. The glorious object of his trust, Christ, risen and glorified, the royal Seed of David, exalted on the throne of universal power. 2. The example of the apos-

8 Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David
was raised from the dead, according to my gospel:
9 Wherein I suffer trouble, as an evil doer, *even* unto
bonds; but the word of God is not bound.

8 Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, of the
9 seed of David, according to my gospel: wherein
I suffer hardship unto bonds, as a malefactor; but

tle himself, who is enduring suffering even unto bonds as a malefactor, that God's chosen may obtain salvation with eternal glory, while yet the word of God, for which he suffered, was, notwithstanding, advancing in triumph. 3. The sure results alike of enduring and of refusing such suffering; on the one hand, death with Christ insures life with him, suffering with Christ reigning with him; on the other, if any shall deny Christ he will deny them; if any are unfaithful, he remains faithful to his word, his unchanging truth rendering absolutely certain the fulfillment alike of his promises and his threatenings.

8. Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead—*Remember Jesus Christ as risen from the dead, of the seed of David.* The resurrection of Christ was not only the crowning proof of his Messiahship and of the truth of his gospel, but, above all, culminating in his glorification, it revealed him as the living, exalted, Almighty Redeemer; and it was as such that Timothy should think of him, as an incentive to suffering with him. That once suffering Saviour is not now in the tomb dead. Death had no power over him. He broke its bands, and now, as the reward of his suffering, he is living, glorified, invested with all power in heaven and earth. As he through suffering attained to eternal glory, so also shall those who suffer with him. "Remember Christ risen, so as to follow him. As he was raised after death, so, if thou wouldst share his risen life, thou must now share his death." (Fausset.) 'Of the seed of David'—a further description of Christ; the words standing in this position in the Greek. The resurrection and royal exaltation of Christ was the fulfillment of God's promise to David. (2 Sam. 7 : 12-16; Acts 13 : 33-37; Rom. 1 : 3, 4.) He was the true Son of David, the Heir of all the glorious promises made respecting David's throne and kingdom. Exalted to universal dominion, he took his seat on that heavenly throne, of which David's was the humble earthly type; and, as we think of him thus invested with all power, it should inspire us to endure hardship with him and his cause. Possibly, also, the reality of Christ's human nature is here emphasized. As 'of the seed of David,' he had a true human nature, and passed through a real human life, with actual human sufferings. He "was tempted in all points like as we are," and thus, "in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted." (Heb. 2 : 9-18; 4 : 15.) This risen, glorified Christ is man, one with us, though thus exalted; and the thought of him, in his perfect fellowship and infinite sympathy with us, should nerve us to suffering with him. **According to my gospel.** A risen Christ, as the hope and inspiration of his church, was the constant teaching of the apostles. Before the sorrowing and persecuted believers they set forth the glorious array of ancient heroes of faith, "so great a cloud of witnesses," and then bade their disciples "run with patience the race set before them, *looking unto Jesus*, the Author and Finisher of faith, who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." (Heb 12 : 1-3; 1 Cor. 15 : 15-20; 1 Peter 1 : 3.)

9. Wherein (namely, in proclaiming the gospel) **I suffer trouble, as an evil doer, even unto bonds.** Before, he has directed Timothy to Christ, the risen Saviour, as the inspiration to suffering for the gospel; now, as a second incentive thereto, he cites his own example. The wonderful catalogue of his sufferings for the sake of the gospel is twice given at length. (2 Cor. 6 : 4-10; 11 : 23-28.) It has no parallel in human history; and the apostle's example, in this utter self-abnegation for the gospel, of which Timothy had been a constant personal witness, might well inspire in him a like heroic faith. These sufferings, which had attended his entire ministry, culminated in the *bonds* of his final imprisonment under Nero, in which he was held as a malefactor, a criminal, and which was probably the severest ordeal of his life. **But the word of God is not bound.** The apostle himself is bound; but he exults in the thought, here parenthetically expressed, that the word of God—that mighty word, originating with God, and made "quick and powerful" by his pres-

10 Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sake, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory.
11 *It is* a faithful saying: For if we be dead with *him*, we shall also live with *him:*

10 the word of God is not bound. Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sake, that they also may obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with
11 eternal glory. Faithful is the [1]saying: For if we

1 Or, *saying; for if, etc.*

ence therewith—is not bound. With irresistible, divine energy it is advancing in its career of triumph, even while its defenders suffer imprisonment and martyrdom. Men die, but Christ and his gospel live and triumph through the ages; and this thought is to Paul, even amid the defection of friends and the rage of foes, a fountain of joy and hope. (Acts 20:24; 21:13.) "The teacher was bound, but the word was flying abroad; he dwelt in a prison, but his doctrine ran, as if endowed with wings, over all the world." (Chrysostom.)

10. Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sake, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory. 'Therefore' is to be construed with what follows. Compare 1 Tim. 1:16; Philem. 15. The reason he endures hardship is that the elect also—the whole chosen people of God, as well as those who are already partakers—may obtain salvation with eternal glory. They were "chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world" (Eph. 1:4); therefore it is "the salvation which is in Christ Jesus." But though "the elect," they are appointed to be saved "through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth" (2 Thess. 2:13); and the preaching of the gospel, therefore, is necessary to their obtaining salvation. The apostle thinks of himself as God's messenger to carry salvation to the elect, whom God has chosen as his own people; and such a mission, in which the Lord himself laid down his life (John 10:11, 15), seems to him worthy of utter self-devotement, even unto bonds and death. See the same thought—Col. 1:24—where, speaking of himself, he says: "Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church." "Next to the salvation of our own souls, we should be willing to do and suffer anything to promote the salvation of others." (Henry.) 'Salvation' is conceived by the apostle as a present possession, already secured (Eph. 2:5), but this is to find its completion in 'eternal glory.' See Rom. 8:14–25, where this thought is developed at length. Salvation, as now possessed by the believer, is only in its incipiency and potency: it will hereafter be developed in its completeness at "the adoption—to wit, the redemption of our body." Eternal glory is thus the grand goal of that salvation we have already obtained by faith. "Salvation begins with our regeneration, and is completed by our perfect deliverance, when God takes us away from the miseries of this mortal life, and gathers us into his kingdom. To this salvation is added the participation of heavenly, that is, divine, glory; and, therefore, in order to magnify the grace of Christ, he gave to salvation the name of 'eternal glory.'" (Calvin.)

11. It is a faithful saying. This refers to the following sayings, and is intended to emphasize them as containing weighty and indubitable truth. The rhythmical form of these sayings certainly suggests that they may have formed part of a hymn sung in the apostolic churches, or of a well-known, inspired utterance of one of the Christian "prophets" (Eph. 4:11); but of this the evidence is not certain. The plain design of their use here is to present, as a third motive for suffering in Christ's cause, the certain results—on the one hand, of enduring hardships with him; and, on the other, of shrinking from such hardships, and thus denying him. **For if we be dead** (*died*) **with him.** Faith in Christ united us with him in his death (Rom. 6:1-13; Col. 3:3; 1 Peter 2:24); but this union with him involves, not only a new relation to him, whereby through his death we have justification with God, but also a true and real fellowship with him in the spirit and objects of his death, so that in our present life we "know the power of his resurrection and have fellowship with his sufferings, being made conformable to his death." (Phil. 3:10; 2 Cor. 4:10; 6:9.) "Here, also, as in other places (Rom. 6:5; Eph. 2:5), a fellowship with Christ is set forth which is a complete fellowship of life, and, consequently, also a fellowship of fortune, not barely of thought

12 If we suffer, we shall also reign with *him:* if we deny *him*, he also will deny us:
13 If we believe not, *yet* he abideth faithful: he cannot deny himself.
14 Of these things put *them* in remembrance, charging *them* before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, *but* to the subverting of the hearers.

12 died with him, we shall also live with him: if we endure, we shall also reign with him: if we shall
13 deny him, he also will deny us; if we are faithless, he abideth faithful; for he cannot deny himself.
14 Of these things put them in remembrance, charging *them* in the sight of [1]the Lord, that they strive not about words, to no profit, to the subverting of

1 Many ancient authorities read *God*.

and feeling." (Beck.) **We shall also live with him.** This spiritual death with him, with its consequent "fellowship with his sufferings," and readiness to suffer, if need be, bodily death with him, is the sure pledge of life with him, not only present spiritual life (Rom. 6 : 8), but also the future resurrection life (Rom. 8 : 10, 11 ; Phil. 3 : 10-21). The necessary result of sharing his death now is the eternal sharing of his life.

12. If we suffer (*endure*) **we shall also reign with him.** "They who suffered with David in his humiliation were preferred with him in his exaltation; so it will be with the Son of David." (Henry.) The union with him in suffering, by enduring hardship and death for him, insures ultimate exaltation with him. See Matt. 19 : 27–29; Luke 22 : 20–30; Rom. 8 : 17; 1 Peter 1 : 7–9; 4 : 12–13; Rev. 1 : 10; 2 : 10; 3 : 21. How must this glorious truth, believingly apprehended, have thrilled the souls of the confessors and martyrs of Christ in ages of persecution! But it does not come to them only. "Every Christian is under obligation to die with Christ through the mortifying of his own pleasures and desires, and to put to death his former sins through the martyrdom of penitence." (Quesnel.) **If we deny him, he also will deny us.** The denial of him is put into the hypothetical form as something possible. Our Lord himself declared this with marked emphasis. (Matt. 10 : 33 ; Mark 8 : 38.) Such denial, as it involved a preferring of self above him, was itself proof that there had been no real death with him; and he will therefore say to such at the last day: "I *never* knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity!" (Matt. 7 : 23.) The denial of Christ here intended is not the outcome of temporary weakness of faith, as in the case of Peter (Luke 22 : 54-62), but of the nature of the man, in whom self has never been crucified and Christ has never been enthroned.

13. If we believe not—that is, *are in a state of unbelief*, referring to the condition of those who, refusing to credit God's word, are utterly without Christian faith, and, as the consequence, refuse to suffer hardship for Christ. The present tense denotes the habitual state; it does not refer, therefore, to those cases of temporary obscuration of faith, or of unfaithfulness, which may occur in the life of even a regenerate person. **He abideth faithful**—that is, to his word, which, being the expression of his immutable nature, can never be forfeited; whether it be his word of promise or his word of threatening, as just cited, 'If we deny him, he also will deny us.' Christ will never depart from that solemn word, which pledges him, at the last day, to own those who have owned him, and to deny those who have denied him. **He cannot deny himself.** As a being of perfect truth, he cannot prove false to his word. (1 Sam. 15 : 29 ; Titus 1 : 2 ; Heb. 6 : 18.) "Three things are impossible to God—to die, to lie, and to be deceived." (Augustine.) As the unchangeable Jehovah, his word of threatening is as sure as his word of promise: both rest on the immutable foundation of his eternal truth and faithfulness.

14-26. Directions to Timothy Respecting his Spirit and Conduct as a Christian Teacher, Especially in Dealing with Heretical and Disturbing Tendencies.

I. **14-18.** The apostle enjoins him: 1. To put the people in mind of the truths stated above (ver. 8-13), earnestly charging them to avoid strifes of words, which are both useless and pernicious. 2. To present himself to God approved, as a workman faithful and skillful in handling the word of truth. 3. To shun vain speculations, the tendency of which is ever to greater error and sin; a tendency which has already shown itself in the case of Hymeneus and Philetus, men who thereby fell into a destructive heresy, affirming that the resurrection is already past, and who are thus subverting the souls of others.

14. Of these things put them in remembrance—that is, the things just mentioned. (Ver. 8-13.) The pre-supposition is, that

15 Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.
16 But shun profane *and* vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness.

15 them that hear. Give diligence to present thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, [1] handling aright the word of truth.
16 But shun profane babblings: for they will proceed

1 Or, *holding a straight course in the word of truth.* Or, *rightly dividing the word of truth.*

they had already been taught them, but they needed to be reminded of them. **Charging them before the Lord**—as if in the presence of the Lord. (1 Tim. 5:21; 2 Tim. 4:1.) Instead of 'the Lord,' the Sinaitic, Ephraem, and other codices read *God*, a reading which is adopted by Tischendorf and by Westcott and Hort. **That they strive not about words**—an evil specially prevalent in the Ephesian Church. (1 Tim. 6:4.). They disputed about trifles, where the difference was one rather of words than of substance. Or the reference may be to the "vain jangling," "profane and old wives' fables," and "endless genealogies," in which they were so prone to indulge. Such a disposition to wrangle about words indicated a frivolous mind, destitute of the truth itself. **To no profit, but** (*tending*) **to the subverting of the hearers**—'subverting,' or destroying, the opposite of edifying. (2 Cor. 13:10.) Such word-strifes are not only wholly useless, but they also tend to the ruin of the hearers. They increase rather than remove doubts, while they stir up the bitterest passions.

15. Study to shew thyself approved unto God. Timothy, in contrast with the teachers above mentioned, is to be chiefly concerned to present himself to God as one 'approved'; that is, one who has been tested, and has successfully passed the test. One 'approved' is the opposite of "reprobate" (Titus 1:16), or *a castaway* (1 Cor. 9:27), one who has been tested and has been thereby proved worthless. While careful, by the manifestation of the truth, to commend himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God, his chief thought should be, not of men's approval, but of the approval of God. "He commands Timothy to keep his eyes fixed on God; as if he had said: Some aim at the applause of a crowded assembly, but do thou study to approve thyself and thy ministry to God." (Calvin.) **A workman that needeth not to be ashamed**—one having no occasion to be ashamed; that is, at God's judgment in the last day, when every man's work will be tested, "of what sort it is." (1 Cor. 3:9-15; 4:3-5; Phil. 1:20.) The care of every minister, therefore, should be so to labor that in the day when his work shall be tried, it may receive God's approval. The 'workman that needeth not to be ashamed' is the opposite, alike of those good, but careless men, whose work, built of "wood, hay, stubble," "is burned," though they themselves are saved, "yet so as by fire"; and of those "false apostles, deceitful workers," whose work brings ruin, not only to others, but also to themselves. (2 Cor. 11:13-15.) **Rightly dividing** (*handling aright*) **the word of truth.** The word translated 'rightly dividing' signifies *cutting straight*, as in laying out a road, or marking a furrow. (Prov. 11:5.) "Ploughing the furrows of spiritual tillage in a straight line." (Theodoret.) Here it means rightly administering or handling. The reason he will not be ashamed is that he has rightly handled the word of truth. It was done in such manner as to meet the approval of God. He presented with fidelity and skill the solemn, glorious truths of the gospel, and pressed them on the consciences and hearts of men; refusing to occupy himself in frivolous strifes and questions, or in tortuous interpretations of God's word. (2 Cor. 2:17; Gal. 2:14.) "Let him pass over nothing, let him add nothing, let him mutilate, tear in pieces, and wrest nothing; finally, let him diligently consider what the hearers are capable of receiving and what conduces to edification." (Beza.)

16. But shun profane and vain babblings—stand aloof from, as one who shrinks from an object of disgust or terror. (1 Tim. 6:20; Titus 3:9.) 'Profane babblings,' empty discourses, having sound rather than substance, dealing with subjects which are trifling rather than serious and weighty. "The reference is to such controversies and doctrines as tended only to produce strife, and were not adapted to promote the edification of the church." (Barnes.) **For they will increase unto more ungodliness**—that is, those who indulge in profane babblings will advance to a higher pitch of impiety. The necessary tendency of such is from bad to worse, ever de-

17 And their word will eat as doth a canker: of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus;
18 Who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some.

17 further in ungodliness, and their word will [1]eat as doth a gangrene: of whom is Hymenæus and Phi-
18 letus; men who concerning the truth have [2]erred, saying that [3]the resurrection is past already, and

1 Or, *spread* .....2 Gr. *missed the mark*.....3 Some ancient authorities read *a resurrection*.

veloping into more pernicious errors and worse courses of conduct.

17. And their word will eat—literally, *will have pasture*, "the medical term for the consuming process of mortifying disease." It is "an eating sore," which feeds on, and thus spreads through, contiguous parts of the body. **As doth a canker** (*a gangrene*), "a tumor, when in the state between inflammation and mortification." (Hippocrates.) The obvious thought is, that the tendency of profane babblings is to increased perversion of doctrine and deterioration of character, alike in the individual and in the whole church. Such teaching is like a cancer, whose roots are ever penetrating more deeply, and whose ravages at last waste and destroy the whole body. The apostle foresees that the errors of these false teachers will infect and spread through their hearers, and thus steadily work their moral destruction. "No man can safely hold a single error, any more than he can safely have one part of his body in a state of mortification"; and what is true of the individual soul is true also of the church as a body. Error is a diffusive poison, rapidly spreading through the whole body, and tending to vital decay and ultimate destruction. **Of whom are Hymeneus and Philetus.** The former is mentioned probably in 1 Tim. 1: 20, where he is spoken of as having put away a good conscience and made shipwreck of faith. Of the latter, we have no further knowledge. These were men who illustrated in their career this tendency of profane babblings to increase to the worse; for, beginning in empty speculations, they had now advanced to the perversion of a cardinal truth of the gospel.

18. Who concerning the truth have erred—literally, *missed the mark*. (1 Tim. 1: 6; 5: 21.) **Saying that the resurrection is past already.** The denial of a future bodily resurrection, though a conspicuous feature among the Gnostics of the second century, had its roots in the apostolic age. The Sadducees, Therapeutae, Essenes, and other sects rejected the doctrine of a resurrection; the Greek philosophers scoffed at it as the dream of a madman (Acts 17: 32), and within the church itself some at Corinth taught "that there is no resurrection of the dead." (1 Cor. 15: 12.) The form in which this great truth was here denied was, that the resurrection was already past. Possibly they regarded the promise of the resurrection as already fulfilled in the resurrection of some of the bodies of the saints, in connection with Christ's rising from the dead (Matt. 27: 53); but more probably they perverted Paul's words (Rom. 6: 4; Eph. 2: 6; Col. 2: 12), where the believer is represented, in his regeneration, which is symbolized in baptism, as dying and rising with Christ; and thus, by a false spiritualizing, they interpreted the resurrection as occurring at conversion, when the soul rises out of the death in sin into the new life in Christ. "Death and resurrection were terms which had with these false teachers only a spiritual meaning and application; they allegorized the doctrine and turned all into figure and metaphor." (Ellicott.) **And overthrow** (*are overthrowing*) **the faith of some.** (Titus 1: 11.) The leaven of evil doctrine was spreading from them, with the danger that it might diffuse its destructive influence through the whole body. (1 Tim. 1: 19, 20.) "It is true there is a spiritual resurrection, but from thence to infer that there will not be a true and real resurrection of the body at the last day, is to dash one truth of Christ in pieces against another. By this they 'overthrew the faith of some,' took them off from the belief of the resurrection of the dead; and if there be no resurrection of the dead, no future state, no recompense of our services and sufferings in another world, we are of all men most miserable. (1 Cor. 15: 13-19.)" (Henry.)

II. **19-21.** Timothy is not, however, to be discouraged when such perverters of the gospel appear in the church; for 1. The firm foundation of God—namely, his invisible, elect church—stands fast, since the inscription it bears attests that the Lord knows his chosen, and that these will not fall away into error and sin. 2. Such false and heretical teachers

19 Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his. And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.

19 overthrow the faith of some. Howbeit the firm foundation of God standeth, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his: and, Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from

are to be expected in the church, just as in a large house, in addition to vessels of precious material for uses of honor, there are also vessels of base material for uses of dishonor. 3. His chief care, therefore, should be to purify himself, so as to be separate from these baser vessels, that he may be a vessel for honor, meet for the Master's use.

19. Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure. Though error thus enters and spreads in the church, and the faith of some is thereby subverted, Timothy is not to despair: the cause of truth rests on God's firm foundation. This foundation is the true, invisible church, as composed of God's elect; "the congregation of the faithful, considered as the foundation of a building placed by God —house (οἰκία), spoken of in the next verse." (Alford.) The invisible church is the permanent, unchanging foundation of the visible: the one is 'sure' (*firm*), as composed of God's elect, who will never be moved from the truth (Eph. 2 : 17-21); the other, built on it, will, in spite of all care, have in it corrupt members, who will be led astray from the faith. (1 Cor. 3 : 9-15.) Heresies, in the divine plan, are permitted, in order to sift the church. Our Lord said, therefore: "It must needs be that offences come" (Matt. 18 : 7), and the apostle warned the Corinthian Church: "There must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you (1 Cor. 11 : 19). In this process of testing, God's chosen ones are revealed, in that they remain firm in the truth. **Having** (*seeing it has*) **this seal** —*inscription*, showing its ownership and destination. In all ages it has been the custom to place inscriptions on the door posts (Deut. 6 : 9; 11 : 20), on pillars and foundation stones (Rev. 21 : 14), and on the corner stones or facades of public structures. These inscriptions generally consist of a brief, expressive form of words, indicating the origin, character, and purpose of the building. In somewhat similar way Christians are "sealed," or certified as God's people by the Holy Spirit, in "the fruits of the Spirit," or the new character-marks that he places on them. (2 Cor. 1 : 22; Eph. 1 : 13; 4 : 30.) **The Lord knoweth them that are his.** The word 'knoweth' often denotes that complete, intimate knowledge which includes the perception and recognition of the object by all the powers—intellectual, affectional, and spiritual; and thus, while it does not directly signify *love, approval, choice*, it still involves these ideas as implied. Thus, "The Lord *knoweth* the way of the righteous" (Ps. 1 : 6); "You only have I *known* of all the families of the earth" (Amos 3 : 2). Jesus said: "I am the good shepherd, and *know* my sheep, and am *known* of mine" (John 10 : 14, 25, 27); and at the Judgment he will say to the hypocrites: "I never *knew* you." (Matt. 7 : 23; Gal. 4 : 9; 1 John 4 : 6-8). In these, and other passages, the word plainly denotes more than a mere intellectual knowledge: it points to such knowledge as involves love, approval, choice. Here, then, the firm foundation of God stands fast, because it consists of God's known or chosen saints. Objects of his choice, and brought by his Spirit into union with him, they will never prove faithless. Christ said: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life and they shall never perish." (John 10: 27, 28.) Others, in the ordeal of trial, will yield to temptation, but these will not fall away. (1 John 2 : 19.) In the darkest period of the Old Dispensation, when even Elijah despaired, God's voice cheered his prophet, saying, "I have reserved to myself seven thousand men who have not bowed the knee to Baal" (1 Kings 19 : 18); and in all ages, amid the most wide-spread apostasies, this great truth—that God has a chosen people who will never apostatise and perish—has been the support and comfort of the discouraged servants of Christ. (Rom. 8 : 35-39; 1 John 2 : 18-20.) **And, Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from iniquity.** This is the other inscription on the 'sure (*firm*) foundation of God,' his elect church. The confession of Christ as Lord in itself involves the renunciation of unrighteousness. (Matt. 16 : 16, 17; Luke 12 : 8.) "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." (1 Cor. 12 : 3.) "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God." (1 John 4 : 2, 15.) A holy life, therefore, is an

20 But in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some to honour, and some to dishonour.
21 If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified, and meet for the master's use, *and* prepared unto every good work.

20 unrighteousness. Now in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some unto honour, and
21 some unto dishonour. If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified, meet for the master's use, prepared unto

essential character mark of him who acknowledges Christ as Lord. Two grand characteristics thus distinguish the true people of God: they are his elect, and therefore are led and guarded by his Spirit; they acknowledge Christ the Holy One as their Lord, and therefore follow him in a life of holy obedience. They "are kept by the power of God, through faith, unto salvation." (1 Peter 1 : 5.) "God's part and man's part are marked out; God chooseth and knoweth his elect. Our part is to believe, and by the Spirit depart from all iniquity, an unequivocal proof of our being the Lord's." (Fausset.) Both inscriptions are supposed to allude to Num. 16 : 5, 21, in which there are expressions nearly similar in form—the false teachers being compared to Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and the true Christians to Moses and the faithful in Israel, who were not carried away in the rebellion, and remained safe when the earth opened and swallowed up the rebellious.

20. But in a great house—that is, the house built on this firm foundation; namely, the visible, professing church, which, in spite of all care, will contain false as well as true professors. (1 Tim. 3 : 15.) The apostle would not have Timothy be discouraged by the presence of heretical and corrupt men in the church, since this was to be expected. **There are not only vessels of gold and silver**—true Christians, in whom the rich grace of God dwells and whose character and life are adorned with the precious virtues of the Holy Spirit. **But also of wood and of earth**—false professors, in whom that grace is wanting and the character and life reveal an unregenerate nature. Thus "gold, silver, precious stones," the genuine and imperishable materials for God's building, are contrasted with "wood, hay, stubble," the false and perishable, as they will appear when he shall subject the work of his servants to his fiery test. (1 Cor. 3 : 12, 13.) A similar contrast between the genuine and the false among professing Christians is found in the parable of the wheat and tares, and of the net. (Matt. 13 : 24-30, 47.) **And some to honour, and some to dishonour**—showing the diverse use and destination of these vessels. Each of these classes, the true and the false, are consciously or unconsciously, willingly or unwillingly, serving the purposes of God and doing his work, but with a service dissimilar in its nature and with a different destined end. "In the visible church, not only true Christians and faithful ministers are found, as willing instruments in the honorable work of glorifying God and promoting the good of men, but persons also of a different character, whose hypocrisy and iniquity are overruled, contrary to their intentions, to fulfill his righteous purposes, though to their own ruin and 'everlasting contempt.'" (Scott.)

21. If a man therefore purge himself from these—separate, keep himself distinct from these false, heretical professors, the "vessels of wood and of earth." He is thoroughly to purify himself, so as to be separate, both in character and association, from them. "All who consecrate themselves to the Lord must purge themselves from the filthiness of the ungodly." (Calvin.) Error and unrighteousness having, like gangrene, a tendency to self-diffusion, safety from it is only found in separation. (1 Cor. 5 : 6-13.) The reference here is not to moral only but also to outward separation. Such must not be held in fellowship, in the association either of the church or of social life. (Rom. 16 : 17; 2 Thess. 3 : 6, 14; 2 John 10.) **He shall be a vessel unto honour**—a Christian adorning the doctrine and the church of God, and used for noble ends in the kingdom of Christ. **Sanctified**—separated, consecrated to the Lord. **Meet for the master's use**—possessed of a spirit and character adapted to the service of the Master. The figure of a household vessel, or utensil, is still present: he will be a vessel worthy to be used by such a Master. **And prepared unto every good work**—filled with all the Christian virtues, and thus in fervent sympathy with every good work, and fitted to engage in it. The thought is of a fully rounded Christian character, in living, holy sympathy with all that is true and noble and Christlike in word and deed. Such a life is described (2 Peter 1 : 5-11) adorned

22 Flee also youthful lusts: but follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart.
23 But foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes.
24 And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all *men*, apt to teach, patient;

22 every good work. But flee youthful lusts, and follow after righteousness, faith, love, peace, with them
23 that call on the Lord out of a pure heart. But foolish and ignorant questionings refuse, knowing that
24 they gender strifes. And the Lord's [1] servant must not strive, but be gentle towards all, apt to teach,

1 Gr, *bondservant.*

with all the Christian graces, and resulting at last in "an entrance ministered abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." (3:17; Titus 3:1.)

III. **22-26.** Timothy is, therefore, to flee youthful lusts and to follow the Christian virtues; to avoid useless questions and strifes, with gentleness instructing those who oppose, in hope that God may lead them to repentance, and that, thus coming to the knowledge of the truth, they may recover themselves from the snare of the devil.

22. Flee also youthful lusts—referring not only to sensual passion, but all the irregular desires and propensities belonging to earlier life, as self-conceit, pride, ambition, love of applause; "any impetuous passions to which the warmth of that age is prone." The apostle has especially in mind such as are the opposite of the after-named virtues. (1 Tim. 6:11.) **But**—only by avoiding such lusts will he be "meet for the Master's use and prepared for every good work." **Follow righteousness**—"moral rectitude, as contrasted with 'unrighteousness' (*ἀδικία*). (Ver. 19.)" (Alford.) **Faith, charity** (*love*)—the sources of true Christian character, from which flow all genuine virtues in the life. "The exciting of our graces will be the extinguishing of our corruptions; the more we follow that which is good, the faster and further we shall flee from that which is evil. Righteousness and faith and love will be excellent antidotes against youthful lusts." (Henry.) **Peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart.** The minister is to "follow peace with all men" (Heb. 12:14); but his deepest, truest sympathy, fellowship, the peace of complacency, should be with true Christians—those who with singleness of heart call upon the Lord. 'Call on the Lord'—a characteristic of the genuine disciple of Christ, and hence used as a descriptive designation. (Acts 2:21; Rom. 10:12; 1 Cor. 1:2.) "The lesson here comes out again, so often and in so many ways presented in these Pastoral Epistles, that a sound moral condition is, above all things, essential to fitness for effective ministerial service in the divine kingdom. Other things may be more or less helpful, but this is indispensable. The peace spoken of is undoubtedly to be understood of peace in the closer sense—a state of inner harmony and agreeable fellowship; because it is such as is to be maintained with them that call on the Lord with pure heart." (Fairbairn.)

23. But foolish and unlearned (*ignorant*) **questions avoid**—rather, *the foolish*, etc.; namely, those which the false teachers debate. 'Foolish (Titus 3:9) (*ignorant*) questionings,' such as arise in an ignorant, undisciplined, ill-regulated mind, and are unworthy of serious attention. (Ver. 16; 1 Tim. 1:4; 4:7.) **Knowing** (as thou dost) **that they do gender strifes**—or, *Since thou knowest.* Such questionings, while having no useful end, tend to mere empty controversy, arousing the worst passions and breeding bitter enmities. Timothy was, therefore, to refuse to consider them. (1 Tim. 6:4; Titus 3:9.)

24. And (*but*) **the servant of the Lord.** The language is general, but the context shows that the minister of Christ is chiefly intended. **Must not strive.** The servant of the Lord must be like his Master, who did not "strive nor cry." (Matt. 12:19, 20.) The meaning is, he must not engage in useless strife, such as is here forbidden. It is his duty to "contend earnestly for the faith" (Jude 3); but he is not to exercise the spirit of a mere polemic, or to be a lover and seeker of contention. **But be gentle unto all men**—'gentle,' as opposed to *harsh, passionate.* His spirit and manner should evince tenderness, kindness, love; and this 'toward all men,' irrespective of parties and preferences. (1 Thess. 2:7.) **Apt to teach.** Here, as in 1 Tim. 3:2, the word includes not only skill in teaching, but also a disposition to teach. Instead of a harsh, imperious, dogmatic spirit in dealing with those who differ, the servant of Christ should be disposed to teach them, dealing with them through the

25 In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth;
26 And *that* they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will.

25 forbearing, in meekness [1]correcting them that oppose themselves; if peradventure God may give them repentance unto the knowledge of the truth,
26 and they may [2]recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, having been [3]taken captive [4]by him unto his will.

1 Or, *instructing*.....2 Gr. *return to soberness*.....3 Gr. *taken alive*.....4 Or, *by him, unto the will of God.* Gr. *by him unto the will of him.* In the Greek the two pronouns are different.

understanding by instruction, rather than exercising a coercive authority. "Ready to teach rather than to contend." (Ellicott.) **Patient** (under evil)—or, *patient of wrong.* The thought is, not only of wrong intentionally inflicted on us, but also of the stupidity, prejudice, misconstruction, and manifold weaknesses of men, which the minister must meet, and which often prove his severest trials. Under all these evils, especially under opposition, he is to be patient, forbearing, as was his Master.

25. In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves. 'Meekness'—better, *gentleness*, in contrast with *harshness, violence.* The opposers referred to are probably those morally diseased persons who were full of useless questionings and restive under sound instruction in the plain, simple gospel. The spirit and conduct of such might easily irritate a pastor, and tempt him to the exercise of harsh authority, seeking to crush rather than instruct the opposer; and against this the apostle warns Timothy. He must not, even under such provocation, cease to be "patient of evil." Many interpreters, as Alford, Fairbairn, Beck, translate *correcting* instead of *instructing*, making the passage enjoin a disciplinary rather than a teaching act. Thus, also, the Revised Version. Without doubt, the Greek word has sometimes this use; but here the context seems to me to be clearly dehorting from the exercise of mere authority in such case, and urging rather to forbearing and kindly instruction. The more usual sense of the word, therefore, is here required. **If God peradventure will give them repentance.** This is the motive to such forbearing, kindly instruction; the hope that, through this means, God may lead them to a right state of mind. Note here, as always, vital religious error has its roots in sin; and in order to its removal there must be repentance, a change in the state of the heart. Note, also, repentance is the gift of God, resulting from the Holy Spirit's work on the soul (Acts 5:31); and because it is God's gift, we are not to despair of any person, however unlikely his conversion may appear to human view. The case of Paul himself should show what a change may be wrought in even the most violent and stubborn opposer, when God gives repentance. But while repentance is God's gift, he gives it through appropriate means; we are, therefore, to be in earnest in seeking to lead men to it by patient instruction and persistent effort. **To the acknowledging of the truth.** The word translated 'acknowledging' (ἐπίγνωσις) signifies *the full apprehension, the realization*, of the truth. Only through a change in the moral dispositions (μετάνοια) do men attain to the full knowledge, the believing apprehension, of the gospel.

26. And that they may recover themselves (literally, *may awake to soberness*) **out of the snare of the devil.** Such opposers have fallen into 'the snare of the devil,' having become deluded and bewildered, as in a drunken sleep, through error and sin; but awaking sober, they awake to righteousness, and escape out of the snare. The snare in which they had been caught was the error by which they became intoxicated; in awaking sober, therefore, they escape from the snare; namely, the intoxicating error. On the figure of awaking from error and sin as from a drunken sleep, compare 1 Cor. 15:34: "Awake to righteousness, and sin not." 'Snare.' Compare Eph. 6:11, "wiles of the devil"; 1 Tim. 3:7; 6:9. **Who are taken captive by him at his will**—or, *having been captured by him unto his will.* They had been ensnared by Satan, to the end that they might be subject to his will instead of God's will. He captured them that they might become, as in fact they did become, obedient to him instead of obedient to God. Thus wicked men are represented as under the inspiration and control of the Satanic will. They walk "according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." (Eph. 2:2.) The Revised Version, with

CHAPTER III.

THIS know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come.
2 For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy,
3 Without natural affection, trucebreakers, false

1 But know this, that in the last days grievous times
2 shall come. For men shall be lovers of self, lovers of money, boastful, haughty, railers, disobedient to
3 parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affec-

some commentators, interpret 'unto his will' of God's will, and 'taken captive by him' of being taken captive by God's servant. Others understand the words, as Fairbairn paraphrases, "that they may return to soberness (so escape) out of the snare of the devil (by whom they had been taken captive) according to the will of him (God), who for this end seconds the efforts of his servants by giving the spirit of repentance and true enlightenment." The view above given, however, seems to me far simpler and more natural; and the difference in the two pronouns used in the Greek is no real argument against it, as examples clearly show that, without a change in the person indicated, there may be a change in the pronoun merely for the sake of emphasis. Thus here: "who have been taken captive by him" (Satan) (to bring them into subjection) "unto *his* will" (instead of God's will).

Ch: 3 : 1-9. GRIEVOUS TIMES PREDICTED IN THE LAST DAYS.—1. The cause of these is explained; it is the rise and dominant influence of men who are grossly immoral in character and life, while yet they have the outward form of godliness, even though they thus deny the power thereof. (2–5.) 2. The precursors of these are already present, and from them Timothy is warned to turn away. They are described as those who, by deceptive arts, are misleading weak and unstable women, drawing them into error and sin; and who, in withstanding the truth, are like the Egyptian magicians that withstood Moses; which ungodly men they also resemble in the utter defeat that shall ere long meet them, when their impious folly will be publicly exposed. (6–9.)

1. This know also. Notwithstanding the hope just expressed in regard to the recovery of errorists, many evil men will arise in the church, who will never be reclaimed. **That in the last days.** This is the common designation in the Old Testament of the Messianic Age, the times after the advent of Christ. It is thus used in the New Testament to designate the New Dispensation, this being the last period of human history. (Acts 2 : 17; 1 John 2 : 18.) Some refer it to the closing days of the Christian period, just prior to the second advent; but this is forbidden, at least as the exclusive reference, by the fact that the wicked men referred to are, in part, already present, and Timothy is exhorted to "turn away" from them. (Ver. 5.) The whole representation points to the immediate, as well as the remote future, as 1 Tim. 4 : 1. Probably such "perilous times' would more than once recur, and the last, occurring before the second advent, may prove the worst, in the wide extent and terrible character of its error and sin. This seems darkly intimated in Matt. 24 : 24; 2 Thess. 2 : 3; 2 Peter 3 : 3; Rev. 20 : 7. **Perilous** (*grievous*) **times will come**—or, *difficult times will set in;* that is, times hard to live in. The reference is probably the same as in 1 Tim. 4 : 1-3; but there the heretical side, the departure from the truth, is emphasized, while here the ethical side, the departure from morality, is specially described.

2. For men shall be lovers of their own selves—or *lovers of self.* The Greek has the article, *the men*, generic for men in general. Selfishness will be a general characteristic of the period. This trait is placed first, because, as the root and essence of all sin, it is the source of the other evil characteristics mentioned. **Covetous**—or, *lovers of money;* filled with a selfish greed for the accumulation of wealth. (Luke 16 : 14.) **Boasters, proud,** *haughty*—men of proud spirit, and supercilious bearing. **Blasphemers**—or, *defamers*; those who openly vilify, or speak evil of others. **Disobedient to parents**—a fontal sin, the source and sign of a general disregard of authority. Refusal to yield obedience to this primal, natural authority tends to a reckless resistance of all rightful government, whether divine or human. **Unthankful**—destitute of gratitude for favors from God or man. (Luke 3 : 35.) **Unholy**—defiled with sin, irreligious.

3. Without natural affection. Bad men

accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good,
4 Traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God;
5 Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.
6 For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts,

tion, implacable, slanderers, without self-control, 4 fierce, no lovers of good, traitors, headstrong, puffed up, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God; 5 holding a form of godliness, but having denied the 6 power thereof: from these also turn away. For of these are they who creep into houses, and take captive silly women laden with sins, led away by divers

sometimes have warm affection for their own kindred; but these sink so low that even this common instinct of nature is destroyed. They become in this inferior to the beasts. **Truce-breakers**—rather, *implacable;* such as will not be appeased, resisting all overtures to reconciliation. **False accusers**—literally, *devils;* such as from malice accuse, or secretly slander others. **Incontinent**—*without self-control;* men of unbridled passions or appetites, who do not or cannot control their evil propensities. The noun is used (1 Cor. 7:5) "incontinency," *inability of self-control;* here the adjective is the opposite of *temperate;* or, rather, *self-controlled.* (Titus 1:8.) **Fierce**—literally, *untamed*, savage, brutal. **Despisers** (*haters*) **of those that are good**—the opposite of Titus 1:8, "a lover of good men"; or possibly more general, *haters of that which is good.*

4. Traitors (*betrayers*)—those who betray confidence or trust reposed in them; possibly referring to those who betrayed Christian brethren to persecutors. (Matt. 24:10; Mark 13:12.) **Heady** (*headlong*)—reckless, impetuous in passion, headlong in action. **Highminded**—or, *puffed up with conceit.* Self-conceit, like smoke, without substance, but puffed out into large volume, envelops and blinds them, distorting and magnifying their view of themselves as compared with others. (1 Tim. 3:6; 6:4.) **Lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God**—those who delight in fashion, frivolity, amusement, revelry, the pleasures of the world, rather than in religion and the service of God. (1 John 2:15; Rom. 16:18.)

5. Having a form of godliness—the outward semblance, or that appearance of piety which is found in a mere religious profession and the forms of public worship. They are not open apostates from Christianity, but professed adherents of Christ. **But denying the power thereof**—that is, by their spirit and conduct. They have the outward form. (Matt. 7:15-20.) Perhaps, like the Pharisees, they are very zealous for the form (Matt. 23); but they have none of the living, saving, power of religion in the character and life. Their works belie their profession.

This passage must be compared throughout with Rom. 1:29-32, where many of the characteristics here ascribed to the false Christian are ascribed to the heathen, as indeed was natural; for sin, having its root in an inordinate self-love, everywhere tends in its development to the same false and corrupt features in the character and life. In both passages, it will be observed, these characteristics are ascribed, not to each individual, but to men in the mass (*the men*), as marked features in the general life. Here they are presented as striking and awful characteristics of the church in those *grievous times;* and, however dark and repulsive the picture thus sketched, the sad reality has more than once appeared in the professed church, in periods of religious declension, when the world has seen "a new heathenism under the name of Christianity." **From such turn away.** Persons of the character above described had already appeared in the church; and Timothy is charged to deal with them, not as with those mentioned in 2:25, "in meekness instructing them," but to 'turn away' from them, as men who had reached a stage of depravation where instruction is useless or impracticable. They must be avoided. (Prov. 9:7, 8; 23:9; Matt. 7:6.)

6, 7. For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women. Probably those referred to were persons who, before embracing Christianity, had practiced magical arts. Men of this sort abounded everywhere in the apostolic age; and there were many of them at Ephesus. (Acts 8:9-24; 13:6; 19:13-19.) 'Creep'; as serpents, or as wolves seeking their prey, in an insidious, stealthy manner. 'Silly women'—a diminutive in the Greek, meaning *little women*, used contemptuously, and probably well rendered, *silly, foolish women.* "As Satan attacked the woman, and not the man, and beguiled Eve, and not Adam, so these, his in-

7 Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.
8 Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith.
9 But they shall proceed no further: for their folly shall be manifest unto all *men*, as theirs also was.

7 lusts, ever learning, and never able to come to the
8 knowledge of the truth. And like as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also withstand the truth; men corrupted in mind, reprobate con-
9 cerning the faith. But they shall proceed no further: for their folly shall be evident unto all men,

struments and emissaries, work themselves into the affections of the weaker vessel, and into the weaker sort of women, as the diminutive word here signifies." (Gill.) On such vain, frivolous, unstable women, these impostors sought, by stealthy and artful means, to exercise their power, leading them into error and sin, and holding them captive, as helplessly bound under the spell of their arts. Of these women, three descriptive statements are made. They are: 1. **Laden with sins**—as if sins were heaped up on them, so that they are burdened under them. Alford, however, suggests a different view: "Their consciences oppressed with sins, and in this morbid state they lie open to the insidious attacks of these proselyters, who promise them ease of conscience if they will follow them." 2. **Led away with divers lusts**—these lusts, or evil desires being the governing forces in their lives, controlling their conduct. Not alone sensual lust, but "the itch and desire after new teachers and new doctrines and practices"; the constant seeking for the sensational, or that which is last in fashion in preachers and churches. Self-gratification, rather than Christian principle, ruled their life. 3. **Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.** They were always learning, turning from one new doctrine to another, in the restless quest for novelty; but, thus unstable, and governed by their fickle lusts, they were never able to attain the real apprehension of the truth. "It is a remark as demonstrable as it is humiliating, that as the truth, so also error and sin have found ever a powerful support in the weaker sex. Compare 1 Tim. 2:14. There lies in the womanly character the foundation, as for the highest development of the power of faith, so also for the highest revelation of the power of sin." (Van Oosterzee.) Compare Rev. ch. 17.

8. Now (*but*), such characters as these deceivers are to be expected, since they appeared even in the ancient period. **As Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses.** These names are found in the Targum of Jonathan (Exod. 7:11, 22), as those of the Egyptian magicians who attempted miracles before Pharoah to offset the miracles of Moses. The Rabbinical writings have many legends respecting them; but the fact here referred to is attested by the Biblical record in Exod. 7, and there is no reason to doubt the tradition respecting the names of these sorcerers. **So do these also resist the truth.** They directly opposed the true gospel by setting up their magical arts in rivalry with the *charisms*, or gifts of the Spirit, as the old Egyptian sorcerers had done in the contest with Moses. Compare the cases of Simon and Elymas (Acts 8:9; 13:6); also the predictions of the coming of false teachers, who shall perform lying wonders in the last days. (Matt. 24:24; 2 Thess. 2:9; Rev. 13:14, 15.) **Men of corrupt minds.** 'Mind,' "the human spirit viewed both in its intellectual and moral aspects." (Delitzsch.) (1 Tim. 6:5; Eph. 4:17-19.) The mind, the very faculty through which God communicates with man, is corrupted. The light within has become darkness. (Matt. 6:23.) **Reprobate concerning the faith**—tested and proved worthless as to the faith in the truths of the gospel. (Titus 1:16.) 'Reprobate;' compare Jer. 6:30; Rom. 1:28; 1 Cor. 9:27; 2 Cor. 13:5. They had received the gospel, but had proved themselves unworthy of it. "A corrupt head, a corrupt heart, and a vicious life usually attend and accompany one another."

9. But they shall proceed no further. In themselves they will grow worse, according to verse 13; 2:16, as all error tends to increased corruption in him who holds it; but in their influence over others, they will not advance; for this will be checked by the exposure of their folly. Error is in its own nature weakness; it "is a palace of ice which at last must melt and tumble down necessarily, when but one ray of the sunlight of truth penetrates it." **For their folly shall be manifest to all men as theirs** (Jannes and Jambres) **also was.** 'Folly' — *senseless wickedness;* the ethical as well as the intellect-

10 But thou hast fully known my doctrine, manner of life, purpose, faith, longsuffering, charity, patience,

10 as theirs also came to be. But thou didst follow my teaching, conduct, purpose, faith, longsuffering,

ual aspects of their conduct are here characterized. The true character of these men and of their acts and doctrines would soon be fully exposed; just as, in the progress of the conflict, the folly and impotence of the Egyptian magicians was; when even they themselves were compelled to confess the utter failure of their magical arts, and, yielding the contest, they said of Moses' miracle, "This is the finger of God"; and when, in attempting to produce the "boils" on others, "the magicians could not stand before Moses, because of the boil, for the boil was upon the magicians." (Exod. 8:18, 19; 9:11.) It is evident that the men here referred to, after entering the church, had relapsed into the practice of their magical arts. (Acts 19:18, 19.) Like Simon, they had never really received the truth, but were "still in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity"; and now, taking advantage of the superstition, which yet to some extent held its grasp on members of the church who but lately came out from heathenism, they used their corrupt and deceptive arts to pervert the principles and faith of the weak, in order to secure the gratification of their own sensual lusts and the accumulation of wealth. They craftily sought access to the more frivolous and unstable among the female members, to lead them astray, who doubtless all the more readily yielded to their arts in that, before entering the church, they had been believers in magic, and had lived under its manifold forms of deception.

10-17. Exhortation to Steadfastness in these Perils.—To this he is incited: 1. By the remembrance of his faith, as shown, at his conversion and entrance on the ministry, when, inspired by the teachings and life and heroic sufferings of Paul, with the Lord's deliverance out of them, he became an ardent follower of the apostle. (10, 11.) 2. By the fact that persecution is not a strange thing, but must be expected by all those who resolve on a life of Christian piety; while, also, evil men and seducers will wax worse and worse. (12, 13.) 3. By the confidence he reposes in those from whom he received the gospel, and by his early training in the Scriptures, which are able to make wise unto salvation. (14, 15.) 4. By the sure guidance and help he has in Holy Scripture, (*a*) as divinely inspired, (*b*) as useful to give complete fitness for all duties and dangers, and for every good work. (16, 17.)

10. But thou—in contrast with these deceivers. **Hast fully known**—or, *didst follow* as a disciple with full sympathy and approval. Not, "hast fully known," as in the Common Version, but according to the Sinaitic, Alexandrian, and Ephraem Codices, with cursive MS. 17, *didst follow*. The reference is to Timothy's conversion, of which the teaching and life and sufferings of the apostle seem to have been the means; and in connection with which, inspired by the lofty qualities in Paul, he became his enthusiastic and devoted follower. He had not only fully known Paul's teachings and spirit and life, but, with hearty approval and sympathy, had followed him as in these respects his model. **My doctrine**—or, *teaching*—the doctrines or principles Paul had taught, including also probably his spirit and methods in teaching. These had been to Timothy the models of doctrine after which he had patterned his instruction—"guiding stars, as it were, which he followed." **Manner of life**—course of conduct, or principles of life. Timothy had modeled his life after Paul's, heartily adopting the same self-abnegation and consecration to Christ and his gospel. **Purpose**—referring to the steadfast purpose in Paul to devote himself without reserve to the ministry of the gospel, to which Christ had called him. (Acts 20:24; 21:13, 14; 1 Cor. 2:2; 2 Tim. 4:7.) **Faith**—here, if anywhere in these epistles, in the sense of *fidelity, faithfulness;* but it is more probably to be taken in the usual sense of belief or trust in God's word, as an actuating principle in the life. **Longsuffering**—toward opposers and erring brethren. (Gal. 5:22; Eph. 4:2; Col. 3:12; 2 Tim. 4:2.) **Charity**—or, *love;* here, perhaps, love toward men, *charity*. (1 Cor. 13.) **Patience**—patient bearing of evil, without swerving from the temper and faith of the gospel. (Rom. 2:7.) These things in Paul had, in Timothy's earlier life at Lystra, inspired his youthful love and devotion, and led him to consecrate himself to a like service of Christ. The apostle, there-

11 Persecutions, afflictions, which came unto me at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra; what persecutions I endured: but out of *them* all the Lord delivered me.
12 Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.
13 But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived.

11 love, [1] patience, persecutions, sufferings; what things befell me at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra; what persecutions I endured: and out of them all the
12 Lord delivered me. Yea, and all that would live
13 godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution. But, evil men and impostors shall wax worse and worse

1 Or, *steadfastness*.

fore, reminds him of this to strengthen his faith and preserve him steadfast in coming trial, in the hope that, as at his conversion, so now, Timothy would faithfully follow him, as he followed Christ. In like manner, Paul elsewhere refers to his own spirit and life and work as an example, both as a model of ministerial life and as an incentive to personal holiness. (Acts 20 : 18-35; 1 Thess. 2 : 1-12.) Thus, also, he reminds the Hebrew Christians of their earlier devotion to Christ and readiness to suffer for his sake, as an incentive to fidelity in present and impending trials. (Heb. 10 : 32-35.)

11. Persecutions, afflictions, which came unto me. He now cites especially the persecutions and sufferings which met him at the time of Timothy's conversion, and in full view of which, with the Lord's deliverance of him out of them, Timothy had consecrated himself to the ministry. **At Antioch**—in Pisidia, whence Paul was driven by persecution. (Acts 13 : 50.) **At Iconium, at Lystra**—cities of Lycaonia, where he met with the most bloody violence. (Acts 14 : 5-19.) Elsewhere he gives an extended catalogue of his persecutions and sufferings, many of which Timothy had doubtless witnessed (2 Cor. 11 : 23-28); but here he cites only those which had been connected with Timothy's conversion and self-devotement to the ministry as an assistant to the apostle. The fearful scene in Lystra, when Paul was stoned and left for dead, the young disciple had probably himself witnessed; while the story of Paul's heroic faith and fearless confession of Christ in the other cities was doubtless widely known in all that region, and inspired the heart of the youth to endure, with like faith and courage, similar sufferings, if need be, in the service of the Lord. **What persecutions I endured: but out of them all the Lord delivered me.** As an encouragement to Timothy, to strengthen him for the coming perils, he not only recalls these early persecutions, in full view of which he had given himself to the work, but also the marked divine deliverance from them. The preservation of Christ's faithful servant had been even more conspicuous than his sufferings. Compare 4 : 17, 18. "As if he had said: Thou hast known by experience that God has never forsaken me, so that thou hast no right to hesitate to follow my example." (Calvin.)

12. Yea, and all that will live godly in (fellowship with) **Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution.** 'That will'—have the earnest, steadfast purpose; are resolved to live godly. 'In Christ Jesus'—the inspiring source and the sphere of a truly pious life. Compare Gal. 2 : 20; Phil. 1 : 21. No man lives a life of true godliness, except in virtue of a living union by faith with Jesus Christ. (John 15 : 4, 5.) He intimates that Timothy, instead of being surprised and cast down by persecution, should expect it as the natural and common lot of those who resolve on a life identified with Christ. The enmity between the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman develops itself in every age and under manifold forms. (Gen. 3 : 15.) He that is born of the flesh persecutes him that is born of the Spirit. (Gal. 4 : 29.) The words of Christ to his disciples remain forever true: "The servant is not greater than his lord; if they have persecuted me they will also persecute you." (John 15 : 19, 20; 16 : 33; Matt. 10 : 16-25.) It is the duty of the Christian so to teach and so to live as to commend himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God (2 Cor. 4 : 2), and thus compel the inward respect of even wicked men for his sincerity and consistency; but a decided, earnest Christian spirit and life will always evoke some form of opposition from the ungodly world. The radical antagonism of the world to Christ is as real and deep now as when men cried: "Crucify him! crucify him!" although it may not always and everywhere find the same form of expression.

13. But—in contrast to those who 'live godly in Christ Jesus.' **Evil men and seducers**—literally, *sorcerers*, or, *magicians*. (Ver. 8.) **Shall wax worse and worse**—*ad*

14 But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned *them;*
15 And that from a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.
16 All Scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

14 deceiving and being deceived. But abide thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of [1] whom thou hast learned
15 them; and that from a babe thou hast known the sacred writings which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ
16 Jesus. [2] Every scripture inspired of God *is* also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction,

1 Gr. *what persons*.....2 Or, *Every scripture* is *inspired of God, and profitable.*

vance in the direction of the worse. See ver. 1, 9, above. "There the *diffusion* of the evil was spoken of; here its *intensity.*" (Alford.) Though the spread of the evil may be repressed by the early exposure of these men, yet the men themselves will go from bad to worse, according to the natural tendency of error and sin. **Deceiving and being deceived.** Sin is here its own punishment; for "living in an element of deceit, they come to be themselves deceived." "Deception always involves self-deception." (De Wette.) This is an inexorable law of our moral being: he who perverts the truth, in the very act destroys his own power to see the truth, and opens his soul to the influx of error.

14. But continue thou—in contrast with these deceivers. **In the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of.** Though deceivers will deceive themselves and others, let them not deceive thee; but do thou adhere firmly to the truths thou hast been taught and the convictions thou hast formed. Let nothing turn thee from the gospel thou hast believed. See John 8 : 31, 32; Eph. 4 : 14; Heb. 3 : 14; 5 : 12; 10 : 38, 39. **Knowing** (as thou dost) **of whom thou hast learned them.** According to the Sinaitic, Alexandrian, and some other codices, the pronoun 'whom' is here plural, and the reference, therefore, is to his mother, Eunice, and his grandmother, Lois (1 : 5), but probably not excluding the apostle himself. Some editors, however, with Ellicott, retain the singular pronoun 'whom,' making the exclusive reference to Paul. In either case the thought is of the reliable source of his knowledge; he had received it from those entitled to his highest confidence.

15. And that from a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures—the Scriptures of the Old Testament, which these pious persons had from earliest childhood taught him. 'From a child'—or, from infancy, the word βρέφος signifying very early age. The Jewish children were taught the Scriptures by memorizing them as soon as they could speak. Rabbi Judah says: "The boy of five years of age ought to apply to the study of the Sacred Scriptures." "The piety of Timothy is traced by the apostle to the fact that he had been early taught to read the Scriptures, and a great proportion of those who are in the church have been early made acquainted with the Bible." (Barnes.) **Which are able to make thee wise unto salvation.** 'Which are able.' They are now and always able; "the present is used to denote the permanent, enduring property of the Holy Scriptures." (Ellicott.) Not, however, that salvation resides, as a magical power, in the mere words of Scripture, or even in its truths; but rather that the truths of Scripture present to the mind the true objects of faith, and are the medium through which the Holy Spirit exerts his renewing, saving power. (1 Peter 1 : 23; John 17 : 17.) **Through faith which is in Christ Jesus**—that is, the faith which rests on Christ. It is through this faith that the truths of Scripture lead to salvation. "Not every one can be made wise unto salvation by the writings of the Old Covenant, but only every one who believes in Christ. Faith in Christ is, as it were, a torch, by the light of which we can first read aright and understand the dim colonnades and mysterious inscriptions in the ancient venerable temple of the Old Covenant." (Van Oosterzee.)

16. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable. Two forms of translation here have divided eminent interpreters since the time of Origen, both of which are grammatically and logically possible; either, *Every Scripture* (Scripture in every part) *is inspired by God and profitable*, or, *Every Scripture, being inspired by God, is also profitable.* In both the divine inspiration of the Scriptures is clearly affirmed. For 1. *Scripture* (γραφή), which is used, in the singular or plural, more than fifty times in the

New Testament, designates, in each instance of its use, the Old Testament, as received and used among the Jews in the age of Christ and the apostles. It was, therefore, a technical word, equivalent in usage to a proper name, and as such it might, as here, dispense with the article. 2. *Every Scripture* (πᾶσα γραφή) thus necessarily denotes *holy Scripture in every part*—that is, in all its separate books and passages. The phrase is equivalent to *all Scripture*, including all then known as holy Scripture. For a similar use of *all* or *every* (πᾶσα), see Eph. 2 : 21; 3 : 21; Col. 1 : 15, 23; 1 Peter 1 : 15, 24. If, then, the second form of translation proposed above be taken, the assertion is not, "Every writing, if inspired of God, is also profitable," as if a part of the writings referred to were not inspired, but, *Every Scripture* (that is, Holy Scripture in every part), *since it is inspired by God, is also profitable.* It is profitable because it is inspired by God. "It certainly seems distinctly to imply this vital truth, that every separate portion of the Holy Book is inspired, and forms a living portion of a living and organic whole." (Ellicott.) Thus Origen and some of the Fathers, as also many modern interpreters, as Alford, Huther, and Wordsworth. The first form of translation, however, seems to me the more natural construction of the language. For 1. The apostle's evident design is to set before Timothy the great worth of the truths he had been taught from Holy Scripture; and nothing could be more germane to this purpose than to remind him (*a*) that Scripture is in every part divinely inspired, and (*b*) that it is profitable for the complete equipment of the man of God. 2. The translation of the conjunction (καί, *and*) as *also*, though in some relations proper and necessary, is here extremely harsh; it stands far more naturally as the connective of the two predicates—*inspired of God and profitable.* "Clearly, the adjectives are so closely connected that as surely as one is a predicate the other must be also." (Fausset.) "First, he commends the Scripture on account of its authority, and secondly, on account of the utility which springs from it." (Calvin.) Thus Chrysostom, Gregory Nyssa, Beza, De Wette, Wiesinger, Conybeare, and Fairbairn. 'Is given by inspiration of God'—in the Greek, expressed by a single word (θεόπνευστος); literally, *God-inspired.* In the New Testament the relation of God to Holy Scripture is expressed in three different forms. 1. The language is attributed directly to God: as, "God saith" (Acts 2 : 17); "the Holy Ghost saith." (Heb. 9 : 8.) 2. The language is attributed to God, but as spoken through a human agent; as, the Lord "spake by the mouth of his holy prophets" (Luke 1 : 70); "God . . . spake unto the fathers by the prophets." (Heb. 1 : 1.) 3. The language is ascribed to men speaking as inspired by God; as, "David himself said by the Holy Ghost." (Mark 12 : 36.) "No prophecy ever came by the will of man; but men spoke from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit." See 2 Peter 1 : 21, Revised Version; 1 Peter 1 : 10–12. These are the usual forms by which in the New Testament the relation of God to Scripture is expressed; and in all of them God is represented as the true author of Holy Scripture, while the human writers are the medium through which God makes communication to mankind. It is plain, also, that God, in speaking through a human medium, speaks through the entire faculties, the whole personality of the man; so that the communication, in its forms of thought and diction, bears the perfect impress of the man, with all his idiosyncrasies, while yet it is, in all respects, that which God intended to be made, and is *God-inspired.* **For doctrine** (*instruction*)—not for making one an instructor, but for instructing him who reads; the word has special reference to Scripture as imparting theoretical or doctrinal knowledge in divine things. **For reproof** (*conviction*)—for the detection and reproof of all that is false or wrong as to truth or duty, whether in ourselves or in others. (1 Tim. 5 : 20.) **For correction**—literally, *for making rectification;* for reformation. In 'reproof' (*conviction*), the Scriptures are perhaps conceived chiefly as the rule of faith, convicting of error and guiding to truth, as Gal. 3 : 6, 13, 16; but in *correction*, chiefly as the rule of life, rectifying wrong and restoring to right living, as 1 Cor. 10 : 1–10. **For instruction** (*training*) **in righteousness.** Scripture trains, or educates, by guiding and inspiring the soul in holiness and right living. (Titus 2 : 2.) It is the manual of spiritual education, training the man in right moral and spiritual thinking and feeling and action. Compare Ps. 19 : 8–14; 119.

17 That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

17 for [1]instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work.

CHAPTER IV.

I CHARGE *thee* therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom;

1 [2]I charge *thee* in the sight of God, and of Christ Jesus, who shall judge the quick and the dead, and 2 by his appearing and his kingdom; preach the

1 Or, *discipline*.....2 Or, *I testify, in the sight . . . dead, both of his appearing, etc.*

17. That the man of God may be perfect—"ready at every point" (Alford); "complete in all parts and proportions." (Ellicott.) This is the end, or purpose, of Scripture in its several uses as above described; it would make the man complete in character and life, and in fitness for his Christian calling and work. **Thoroughly furnished unto all good works**—for all that belongs to a Christian man to do. The Scriptures are a full and sufficient guide in all doctrines and duties, completely equipping the man who rightly uses them for every good work.

Note.—The Old Testament, as interpreted in the light of the New, is "profitable" for attaining salvation and perfecting Christian character. Christ, in the Sermon on the Mount, gives assurance that he came, not to destroy, but to fulfill the law, and shows that the New Testament is related to the Old, not as setting it aside, but as completing it. The New is only the unfolding and completing of the Old, as the finished revelation of salvation. Among the apostles, Paul makes specially large use of the Old Testament, using it in all the relations here indicated, for doctrine, reproof, correction, and training in righteousness; and so far from regarding it as belonging only to the past, he everywhere deals with it as the living and mighty word of God, potential for all time as a divinely inspired guide, when interpreted by the New, to salvation and eternal life.

Ch. 4: 1-8. Solemn Charge to Fidelity and Earnestness in the Ministry. —1. He charges Timothy, as in the presence of God and of Christ, the Judge of all, and by his appearing and his kingdom, to preach the word with all earnestness and fidelity. (1, 2.) 2. As incentives to this, he mentions two things that were approaching. (*a*) A time as coming, when some in the church will not endure sound instruction, but will multiply teachers chosen with a view to gratify their lusts, and will thus turn their ears from the truth, and turn aside to fables. Timothy, on the contrary, must be watchful, faithfully and fully accomplishing his ministry. (3–5.) (*b*) His own approaching removal from the work by martyrdom, with an exulting view of his life-conflict as now triumphantly ended, and of the glorious prospect immediately before him, while, as a victor, he awaits the crown of righteousness, which the Righteous Judge shall bestow on him; which crown, however, Christ will bestow, not on him only, but also on all who love his appearing. (6–8.)

1. I charge thee, therefore, before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ. The apostle summons him, as it were, into the presence of God and of the glorified Son of man, placing him before this august presence to receive his charge, as a minister of the gospel. **Who shall judge the quick** (*living*) **and the dead.** Christ is the final Judge, before whom all must stand and render account (Matt. 25: 31-44; Acts 10: 42; 17: 31), especially the ministers, to whom he has entrusted the gospel and the care of the churches. (Rom. 14: 9-12; 1 Cor. 3: 11-15; 2 Cor. 5: 9, 10.) 'The quick (*living*) and the dead'—those who are alive at Christ's coming and those who, having died, shall then be raised; none will escape his judgment. (1 Cor. 15: 1, 52; 1 Thess. 4: 16, 17.) "The emphasis laid on this universality of the judgment is to admonish Timothy of his inevitable responsibility." (Wiesinger.) **At his appearing and his kingdom**—not, 'at his appearing,' etc., but according to the oldest manuscripts and the general consent of interpreters, *and by his appearing*, etc., the words being construed after 'charge,' as that by virtue of which, or in view of which, the charge is given. He first places Timothy in the presence of God and of his final Judge, and then adjures him by all that is solemn and glorious in the revelation of Christ at his

2 Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine.
3 For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears:

word; be instant in season, out of season; [1] reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and teaching.
3 For the time will come when they will not endure the [2] sound [3] doctrine; but, having itching ears, will heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts;

1 Or, *bring to the proof*.....2 Gr. *healthful*.....3 Or, *teaching*.

second appearing and in the eternal kingdom which Christ shall reveal in its power and majesty at that day. For a similar charge, compare 1 Tim. 5:21; 6:13; for construction, Mark 5:7; Acts 19:13; 1 Thess. 5:27.

2. Preach the word—the word of God, the gospel of Christ, as that for which the souls of men are perishing, and which alone will bring salvation. This word uncorrupted, as of sincerity, as of God, in the sight of God, he is to speak in Christ. (2 Cor. 2:17; 5:20.) Justin Martyr, in his second "Apology," thus describes the worship of the early churches: "On Sunday all meet, and the writings of the apostles and prophets are read; then the president delivers a discourse; after this all stand up and pray; then there is offered bread and wine and water; the president likewise prays and gives thanks, and the people solemnly assent, saying, Amen." **Be instant in season, out of season**—be urgent in it; be ever engaged in it. Whatever the time, or place, or presence, let this be the ever-present, all absorbing work. Let no timidity in thee, no personal inconvenience, no gratification of thy taste or pleasure hinder thee in it; but always and everywhere, faithfully and fearlessly declare to men the gospel that God has committed to thee. Do not, indeed, speak without regard to time and place and character (Matt. 7:6; 27:12-14); but remember that the time, which to thy imperfect and often timid view seems unseasonable, not seldom proves to be God's own time, and the word, a word in season. (Eccl. 11:6.) Therefore, "let it be always time for thee; not in peace alone, or in quietness, or when in church. And if thou be in perils, if in prison, if compassed about with chains, if even going forth to death, even at that time, convict, withhold not the word of rebuke." (Chrysostom.) **Reprove** (*convince*), **rebuke, exhort, with all long suffering and doctrine**—literally, *in all long suffering and teaching*, denoting the sphere, or element, in which the acts previously enjoined are to be done. "In every exhibition of long suffering and every method of teaching." (Ellicott.) Patiently enduring stupidity, opposition, and injury, he is to be unwearied in teaching, seeking to convince those who are in error, to reprove those who do wrong, and to stir to action the lagging and careless; endeavoring by all means and in every way, to save souls, and to present at last every man perfect in Christ Jesus. Impatience is one of the chief dangers of the ministry. The pastor thus becomes either discouraged and abandons effort for souls, or irritated and, instead of instructing, denounces them; in either case losing his hold on them, and missing what were in fact divinely given opportunities for saving them.

3. For the time will come when they will not endure (*the*) **sound** (*wholesome*) **doctrine.** Ground of the foregoing exhortation; a time is at hand when they will not put up with the health-giving doctrine of the gospel, and therefore Timothy should be the more diligent to improve the present opportunity, while they will hear. He is speaking of professed Christians, persons within the church. 'Sound doctrine'—the gospel in its simplicity and purity, which gives health, soundness, to the spiritual man. (1 Tim. 1:10; 6:3; 2 Tim. 1:13; Titus 1:9; 2:1, 8.) Those who cannot endure this show thereby that they are at heart opposed to the gospel, and the truth is thus here, as elsewhere, made the touchstone of character, in accordance with the words of Christ. (John 8:43-47; 10:26,27.) Of this 'time,' in its various aspects, he has already spoken (1 Tim. 4:1; 2 Tim. 3:1); its beginnings were already present. **But after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears.** 'Heap': the word marks, in a contemptuous way, the number of teachers they will gather to themselves. The tendency of such as refuse sound instruction under a trained, regular ministry is ever to the multiplication of teachers. Unstable, restless, they seek that which gratifies their fancy, caprice, or passion; or which may chance for

4 And they shall turn away *their* ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.
5 But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry.

4 and will turn away their ears from the truth, and
5 turn aside unto fables. But be thou sober in all things, suffer hardship, do the work of an evangelist,

the hour to be new and popular. The thought is probably of frequent changes from one teacher to another, as by persons who, having no real love for the truth, are led away by novelty. Their preference for teachers is determined, not by regard for the gospel, but by their vagrant tastes and fancies. 'After their own lusts.' Their own pleasure, not God's word, is the standard by which they choose their religious guides. Like Israel of old, they will say: "Speak unto us smooth things; prophesy deceits." (Isa. 30:10.) Of God's faithful preacher, they will say, as did Ahab of Micaiah: "I hate him; for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil." (1 Kings 22.8.) According to the fixed laws of moral being, the tendency of such men is ever to greater error and sin, and it proves true of them that, "because they received not the love of the truth, God gave them up to a reprobate mind, that they should believe a lie." (2 Thess. 2:11, 12.) 'Having itching ears'; the reason they will "heap to themselves teachers." Not seeking wholesome instruction, they are restlessly eager for that which is novel, or sensational, or popular, and which, instead of opposing, falls in with their own lusts. (Acts 17:19-21.)

4. And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables—literally, *from the truth, indeed, they will turn away their ears, but unto the fables will they turn themselves aside.* A further description, showing the result of such a tendency: in the end they will utterly refuse the truth, and will turn aside to the profane and old wives' fables, of which he had before spoken. (1 Tim. 4:7.) This has had repeated fulfillment in history, as in the strange and senseless fables of the Gnostics, and in the *Acta Sanctorum* of the papal church, in which asceticism has been fostered by the legendary lore of hero saints, to whom are ascribed fabulous miracles, wrought through the virtue of monkish austerities and observances. "Whosoever will not listen to what is true, but only to what is pleasant, will at last wholly abandon himself to silly, fantastic chimeras." (Van Oosterzee.)

5. But—in contrast with those just mentioned—**watch thou in all things**—or, *be sober.* It denotes the wakefulness and mental alertness which belong to sobriety, in contrast with the obtuseness and heedlessness in intoxication. *Sober*—those who are under the power of error and sin are mentally and spiritually intoxicated, and are living under the hallucinations and passions of drunkenness; only such as are under the power of truth and holiness are sober, with the clear vision and rightly-balanced mind and heart of sober men. (2:26; 1 Cor. 15:34; 1 Thess. 5:6.) "Maintain thy coolness and presence of mind, that thou be not ensnared into forgetfulness, but discern and use every opportunity of speaking and acting for the truth." **Endure afflictions**—or, as in the Revised Version, *suffer hardship;* that is, the hardship which the exercise of his office brought, in toil, reproach, and persecution. (2:9.) **Do the work of an evangelist.** This office is directly named only here and in Acts 21:8; Eph. 4:11. In the former passage, Philip of Cesarea, the same who had served in Jerusalem as one of the Seven (Acts 6:5), and who subsequently instructed and baptized the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8:26-40), is called "the evangelist"; and in the latter, evangelists are mentioned among the gifts of the ascended Son of man to his church, when from his heavenly throne he "gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." The name indicates their work as pre-eminently that of preaching the gospel (εὐαγγέλιον); and from this passage, as well as from the work of Philip, we may infer as probable that they were itinerant ministers, as Apollos, Timothy, Titus, Luke, and others; and that their work, as distinguished from that of pastors, was rather that of missionaries sent forth to evangelize regions where the gospel was unknown, and organize and strengthen churches on destitute or missionary fields. Here it is plain that Timothy was not "bishop of Ephesus," as some affirm; for had he been such, Paul would have so addressed him. He was an

6 For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand.
7 I have fought a good fight, I have finished *my* course, I have kept the faith:

6 fulfil thy ministry. For I am already being[1] offered,
7 and the time of my departure is come. I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I

1 Gr. *poured out as a drink-offering.*

evangelist, acting as an assistant to the apostle; and, in Paul's absence, charged with some of the apostle's functions. **Make full proof of** (*accomplish fully*) **thy ministry**—fulfill all its duties; "so exercise it that thou duly give attention to all its parts"; leave nothing undone. His ministry should be a complete fulfilling of the office in all its duties and responsibilities.

6. For I. The imminence of the apostle's death is here introduced as an incentive to Timothy to fidelity and earnestness in his work, as if the apostle said: My work is done. No longer can I labor in the gospel. The burden now falls on thee. Be true to Christ and his word, looking forward, as I have done, to the great reward, "the crown of righteousness," which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will bestow—not on me only, but also on thee, if faithful to the end. **Am now ready to be offered**—Revised Version, *Am already being offered;* or, being poured out, as a libation or drink offering, at a sacrifice. His blood is already being poured forth as an offering for the cause of God; so said because the process had already begun, in his trial before Nero, which would certainly and speedily end in the shedding of his blood in martyrdom. As the wine was poured out at the altar in the offering to God (Num. 15:5; 28:7), so his blood is, as it were, already being shed in his then imminent bloody death. Compare Phil. 2:17. "In a most significant way he compares his own martyr death, not with a sacrifice proper or a burnt offering, but with a drink offering of a little wine and oil, which is added like a supplement, and thus connects his dying for the truth with the sacrificial death of the only Martyr. Compare 1 Tim. 6:13; Col. 1:24." (Van Oosterzee.) Others interpret of a libation poured upon the victims preparatory to sacrifice, "in allusion to the custom which prevailed among the heathen generally of pouring wine and oil on the head of a victim when it was about to be offered." Thus Barnes, Fausset. **And the time of my departure is at hand.** The word 'departure' (ἀνάλυσις) is used of unloosing, or casting off, the fastening of a ship, preparatory to its departure on a voyage; and here, "loosing the cable from this earthly shore on a voyage to the eternal harbor of heavenly peace." (Wordsworth.) It suggests a beautiful view of death as at once a release from earth and the passage to the heavenly life.

7. I have fought a (*the*) **good fight**—or (as the language is not restricted to a *fight*, but may denote any form of contest), if the following clause be taken as defining and completing the figure in this, *I have maintained the noble contest;* or, with Ellicott, "The good strife I have striven." He draws a figure, as so often, from the Greek games, and compares his Christian life to a contest among the athletes, who contended for the prize. (Acts 20:24; 1 Tim. 6:12.) With them the contest was for a brief hour, and the prize a corruptible crown; with him the contest, continuous and strenuous, was maintained through life, and the prize was an incorruptible crown. (1 Cor. 9:24-27; Phil. 3:12-14.) "There is nothing nobler than this contest. This crown is indestructible, it is not a thing of wild olives. It has not man for presiding arbiter, nor has it men for spectators; the theatre is filled with angel witnesses." (Chrysostom.) **I have finished my course**—the form of contest is the race. That race is vividly set forth in Heb. 12:1, where "a great cloud of witnesses," the heroes of faith in all the ages past, are beholding the contest and applauding those who "run with patience the race set before" them. To "finish this course with joy" had been the apostle's life endeavor; and now the course was run, the goal was reached, and already his faith beholds the Judge conferring the "unfading crown of glory." **I have kept the faith.** Suspending the figure, he now uses direct speech. The gospel, that sacred trust committed to me by Christ, I have held firmly to the end. 'The faith' here, as is usual in the Pastoral Epistles, is objective, the system of truth contained in the gospel. This, amid all the apostasies of professed friends and all the persecutions of foes, he had unflinchingly held. and he was now about to seal

8 Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.
9 Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me:

8 have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give to me at that day: and not only to me, but also to all them that have loved his appearing.
9 Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me: for

his testimony to these truths by a martyr death.

8. Henceforth there is laid up for me a (*the*) crown of righteousness—that is, the crown which is bestowed in view of, or as the reward of, righteousness. Elsewhere the crown is characterized as to its nature, as "the crown of life," in James 1 : 12; "the crown of glory," in 1 Peter 5 : 4; but here the fitness, or rectitude, of its bestowal is set forth, as is evident from the characterizing of him who bestows it as *the righteous Judge*. The goal is reached; the race is won; it is fitting and right, therefore, that the crown be bestowed on the victor. (Col. 1 : 5; 1 Peter 1 : 4.) 'Laid up'—securely reserved, as a treasure gained and kept in a safe place for the future. **Which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day.** 'Righteous judge'—with special emphasis in the Greek, possibly in contrast with Nero, his unrighteous earthly judge. Christ is the judge from whose hand the victor shall receive the crown; and the time of the award is 'that day,' the day of his glorious appearing and of the final judgment, when, in the presence of the assembled universe, *the Righteous Judge* shall requite and exalt his faithful servants. See Matt. 13 : 49; 25 : 21, 31–46; Luke 19 : 17; Acts 10 : 42; 2 Thess. 1 : 5–10. 'Shall give'—properly, according to nearly uniform usage in the New Testament, *shall recompense, reward*, as the bestowal of that which is in some sense due. Here it is the award of a prize to the victor in a contest. But the reward is wholly of grace; for it was only through the grace of Christ the apostle achieved the victory, and thus obtained the title to the gracious promises of God. He ever declared: "By the grace of God, I am what I am"; "I labored more abundantly than they all, yet not I, but the grace of God that was in me." (1 Cor. 15 : 10.) But God makes gracious promises to Christians; if they fulfill the conditions of these promises, he is righteous in bestowing on them the things promised. (Heb. 6 : 10.) The 'crown of righteousness' is thus awarded as the righteous requital of all the toil and conflict through which the victory has been achieved, and as the just reward of the righteous character which has thereby been attained. The glory of the redeemed will appear, therefore, to the moral universe, not only as exhibiting God's infinite grace, but also as having in itself an absolute moral fitness in the nature of things. (Rom. 2 : 6, 7; 2 Cor. 5 : 10.) **And not to me only.** "It is, however, no special apostolic privilege, no martyr prerogative." (Beck.) At the Grecian games one only could obtain the crown; all others, however earnestly they had striven, must fail. But in the heavenly race the prize is not reserved for a single, distinguished contestant; every earnest soul, however humble his position, if he truly strive to the end, shall win. The Lord will bestow the victor's crown on all who made him the goal of their earthly course. **But unto all them also that love his appearing**—all who, having loved Christ, have longingly looked forward to his glorious appearing. (1 Tim. 6 : 14; Titus 2 : 13; Rev. 22 : 20.) As if he had said: This crown awaits not me alone, but thee also, and all those who have truly loved and followed Christ, with hope fixed on the glory to be revealed when he shall appear. (Rom. 8 : 18-23.) "'Them that love'—*have loved and do love:* habitual love and desire for Christ's appearing, which presupposes faith. (Heb. 9 : 28.) Compare the sad contrast in ver. 10, 'having loved this present world.'" (Fausset.)

9-15. Timothy Urged to Hasten His Coming to Rome.—1. A reason is assigned for this; the apostle is almost forsaken, all his usual fellow-workers, except Luke, having left the city. (10, 11.) 2. In coming he is to bring with him Mark, as also certain articles left behind at Troas. (12, 13.) 3. He takes occasion to put Timothy on his guard against a certain Alexander, who had proved a bitter opposer. (14, 15.)

9. Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me. He makes here an urgent request for that at which he had before only hinted. (1 : 4, 8.) He is about to suffer death, and with a feeling kindred to that of his Lord (Matt. 26 : 37, 38), he desires the presence and sympathy

10 For Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed unto Thessalonica; Crescens to Galatia, Titus unto Dalmatia.
11 Only Luke is with me. Take Mark, and bring him with thee: for he is profitable to me for the ministry.

10 Demas forsook me, having loved this present [1] world, and went to Thessalonica; Crescens to [2] Galatia,
11 Titus to Dalmatia. Only Luke is with me. Take Mark, and bring him with thee: for he is useful

1 Or, *age*.....2 Or, *Gaul*.

of his best-loved friend. Other reasons for hastening his coming were the approach of winter, when traveling would be difficult (ver. 21), and the nearness of his death. (Ver. 7.) It may be, also, that there were urgent needs in the condition of the Christian cause at Rome for Timothy's presence, especially as Paul himself could no longer supervise its interests.

10. For Demas hath forsaken me. This person is mentioned among the apostle's honored fellow-workers. (Col. 4 : 14; Philem. 24.) Demas' desertion of him, therefore, at this hour of peril and suffering, must have been all the more keenly felt. **Having loved this present world**—"that is, the earthly, visible world, with its good things, in opposition to the invisible, still future kingdom of Christ, which was the object of the highest love of Paul, and for the sake of which he endured willingly the heaviest affliction." (Van Oosterzee.) Whether from lack of courage and fortitude, he had shrunk from possible suffering or death, if identified with the apostle in his peril, or from love of pleasure or gain he had been drawn away from the ministerial work into some secular pursuit, is not determined by the text; the latter has been the more common conjecture. In either case his act was not necessarily an apostasy from Christ, as is sometimes hastily inferred; it may have been only a temporary lapse of faith. "Observe the solemn contrast between him who 'loved this present world,' and those who 'love his appearing.'" (Wordsworth.) **And is departed unto Thessalonica**—the modern Salonica, then a great commercial capital of Macedonia, and still one of the largest cities of European Turkey. Chrysostom speaks of this as Demas' native place, and an old, but improbable, tradition states that he became there an idol priest. **Crescens to Galatia**—possibly not Galatia in Asia Minor, but Gaul in Europe, as the same word designated both countries sometimes, and *Gallia* is the reading in the Sinaitic and Alexandrian codices, and in several cursives, with some manuscripts of the early Latin version. Thus also Eusebius and Theodoret. A late tradition reports him as founding the church at Vienne in Gaul. **Titus to Dalmatia**—a part of the ancient Illyricum, on the Adriatic. Crescens and Titus probably went by the apostle's direction, and seem not to be included in the censure on Demas. It would appear, therefore, that Titus had left Crete, after "setting in order" the affairs of the churches there (Titus 1 : 5); had then, according to the apostle's direction (Titus 3 : 12), gone to him at Nicopolis, in Epirus, and thence followed him to Rome, from which place he had now passed to Dalmatia.

11. Only Luke is with me—that is, of his fellow laborers; other friends were with him. (Ver. 21.) By Luke is meant, without doubt, the writer of Luke's Gospel and of the Acts, who had so long and faithfully attended the apostle. He had accompanied Paul during parts of his second and third missionary tours, in his imprisonment at Cesarea, in the voyage to Rome, and his first imprisonment there (Acts 16 : 10; 20 : 6; 24 : 23; 28 : 26); and now he is found with him in his last and most severe imprisonment, on the eve of his martyrdom. Luke was a physician (Col. 4 : 14), as well as an evangelist; and to a Christian character, singularly beautiful in its modest worth, he added a refined Greek culture, as is evident in the Gospel and the Acts written by him. Tradition places the sphere of his later ministry in Gaul, but his tomb is still pointed out among the ruins at Ephesus. **Take Mark, and bring him with thee.** The evangelist Mark, cousin of Barnabas, attended Paul and Barnabas on the first missionary journey, but on reaching Pamphylia left them, apparently shrinking from the danger and hardship—a circumstance which subsequently led to a dissension between the missionaries, and when Barnabas went to labor in Cyprus, Mark accompanied him. At a later period he was with Paul at Rome (Acts 12 : 25; 15 : 38, 39; Col. 4 : 10), and still later he is

12 And Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus.
13 The cloak that I left at Troas, with Carpus, when thou comest, bring *with thee*, and the books, *but* especially the parchments.

12 to me for ministering. But Tychicus I sent to
13 Ephesus. The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, bring when thou comest, and the books, espe-

found with Peter at Babylon. (1 Peter 5 : 13.) It is not known where he was when this Epistle was written; but Timothy is instructed to take him up on his way (compare Acts 20 : 13, 14), and bring him. He seems to have fully redeemed his character, so sadly sullied by the desertion in Pamphylia, and found again the full confidence of the apostle. Tradition connects his later ministry with Egypt and Alexandria. **For he is profitable to me for the ministry.** Whether this refers to personal service to Paul, or to public service as a minister, is not absolutely clear; but the latter is highly probable. As Mark had been much in Rome, it is conjectured that his knowledge of the Latin language and of the Roman people gave him special adaptation to the work there.

12. And Tychicus have I sent to Ephsus—not, 'have I sent.' The expression does not prove that Timothy was not, at this time, in Ephesus; for it may signify *I sent* (as thou knowest). Tychicus was with Paul on his third missionary journey (Acts 20 : 5); and during the first Roman imprisonment the apostle sent him as the bearer of the epistles to the Ephesians, to the Colossians, and probably to Philemon; at which time he characterizes him as "the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord" (Eph. 6 : 21; Col. 4 : 7). He is now sent again to Ephesus, but the purpose is not stated; possibly it was to fill temporarily the place of Timothy while he went to Paul at Rome. **The cloak that I left at Troas, with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee.** Some translate *book case*, or *book bag*, in which books are carried; but cloak is the more probable rendering. It was a long, thick garment, without sleeves, enwrapping the whole body; such a garment as Paul would greatly need in his damp, unwarmed cell. In the stress of persecution, he may have been hurried away from Troas, leaving this, with the books, behind. His deep poverty is evident in his sending so far for such a garment. "The mention of his 'cloak,' so far from being unworthy of inspiration, is one of those graphic touches which sheds a flood of light on the last scene of Paul's life, on the confines of two worlds; in this, wanting a cloak to cover him from the winter cold; in that, covered with the righteousness of saints, 'clothed upon with his house from heaven.'" (Fausset.) This passage plainly supposes that Paul had recently left Troas, and forbids the supposition that this Epistle was written during the first Roman imprisonment; for at that time his last visit to Troas had occurred in the spring, A. D. 58, on his way to Jerusalem. (Acts 20 : 6.) He was then imprisoned at Cesarea two years, after which he reached Rome in the spring, A. D. 61, and spent "two whole years" preaching the gospel "in his own hired house," bringing us to the spring, A. D. 63, before the circumstances under which this Epistle was written could have existed. Thus more than five, and, probably, fully six, years must have passed when he wrote in this way respecting the things left in Troas, a supposition wholly incredible. This circumstance, therefore, seems to me as one of several incidental, but decisive proofs that the Pastoral Epistles were written at a later period than the Roman imprisonment related in Acts, and after Paul had again visited Asia Minor. **And the books, but especially the parchments.** The books, written on papyrus, were more perishable; but the parchments were costly, and doubtless were writings of higher importance. The apostle was now an old man, and was looking forward to a martyr's death; but the love of study remained, and even in the felon's cell he wants his books. Though inspired, perpetual study was with him, as with all men, the source of freshness and power in preaching. "Poor inventory of a saint's possessions! not worth a hundredth part of what a buffoon would get for one jest in Cesar's palace, or an acrobat for a feat in the amphitheatre; but would he have exchanged them for the jewels of the adventurer Agrippa, or the purple of the unspeakable Nero? No, he is more than content. His soul is joyful in God. If he has the cloak to keep him warm, and the books and parchments to teach and encourage him, and if, above all, Timothy will come himself, then life will shed on him its last rays of sunshine; and in lesser things, as in all greater, he will wait with thankfulness, even with exultation,

14 Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil: the Lord reward him according to his works:
15 Of whom be thou ware also; for he hath greatly withstood our words.
16 At my first answer no man stood with me, but all *men* forsook me: *I pray God* that it may not be laid to their charge.

14 cially the parchments. Alexander the coppersmith
[1]did me much evil: the Lord will render to him
15 according to his works: of whom be thou ware also;
16 for he greatly withstood our words. At my first defence no one took my part, but all forsook me:

1 Gr. *shewed.*

the pouring out in libation of those last few drops of his heart's blood, of which the rich, full stream has for these long years been flowing forth upon God's altar in willing sacrifice." (Farrar.)

14. Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil—or, "showed me much ill-treatment." (Ellicott.) Not necessarily "the coppersmith," but used in later Greek of a worker in any of the metals, especially in iron. Whether he is identical with the Alexander mentioned as put forward by the Jews before the Ephesian assembly (Acts 19:33, 34), or with him who is described, with Hymeneus, as a blasphemer and excommunicated person (1 Tim. 1:20), cannot be determined; it is not improbable that in all three places the same person is intended. Possibly Alexander had come to Rome as one of Paul's accusers before the imperial court, and the correct translation here may be, as given by Lange, "laid many evil charges against me"; and now, after the apostle's trial and acquittal on the first charge, he had returned to Ephesus, smarting under his defeat, and likely, therefore, to be the more dangerous to the cause there. **The Lord reward** (*will requite*) **him according to his work**—not an imprecation, but, according to the best manuscripts, a prophecy. Whether he affirms the certainty of this from the general fact that all men will be judged according to their deeds, or from a special revelation made to him in regard to this man, the language here does not decide. But the apostle, refraining from personal judgment, leaves him to the certain and holy judgment of God, assured that it will be according to his works.

15. Of whom be thou ware also. The opposition to the gospel which led him to withstand Paul, would lead him also to oppose Timothy; and the apostle gives this warning against him as a man not to be instructed, as in 2:25, but to be watched and avoided. **For he hath greatly withstood our words.** He had been an aggressive, persistent, and perhaps violent, opposer. 'Our words'—either the gospel as taught by Paul and others at Ephesus, or the words of the apostle in his recent defense before the Roman Court.

16-18. ACCOUNT OF PAUL'S FIRST DEFENSE BEFORE THE IMPERIAL COURT.—He states that on this occasion: 1. No one came forward in his behalf, but all men forsook him; which sin he prays that God will not account to them. 2. Christ, however, stood by him and strengthened him, in order that through him the proclamation of the gospel might be fully made in the hearing of the Gentiles. 3. The result was his deliverance; and he is confident that the Lord will deliver him and preserve him unto the heavenly kingdom, to whom he ascribes the glory unto eternal ages.

16. At my first answer—*public defense* (ἀπολογία), openly made before a court. The charge against him seems to have had two counts, on which he was tried separately. Here the defense was on the first count, and on this he seems to have been acquitted. Possibly the first count charged complicity in the burning of Rome, a crime which Nero charged upon the Christians; and by proving that he was absent from Rome at the time of the conflagration, he obtained acquittal; while the second count may have been the crime of introducing a *religio illicita*, an unlegalized religion, the penalty of which was death. **No man stood with me**—or, *came forward for me;* a forensic expression, signifying that there was no legal advocate, or counsel, but here perhaps referring to the total absence of supporters. He stood before the court wholly unsupported by sympathizing friends, whose presence might cheer him in the trial and might favorably affect the minds of his judges. Even his witnesses seem to have failed him, a fact to which possibly he refers in 1:15, in speaking of "all they which are in Asia" as having "turned away from" him. **But all men forsook me.** The peril of his position was so great that no one had courage to appear

17 Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me; that by me the preaching might be fully known, and *that* all the Gentiles might hear: and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.

17 may it not be laid to their account. But the Lord stood by me, and [1]strengthened me; that through me the [2]message might be fully proclaimed, and that all the Gentiles might hear: and I was de-

1 Or, *gave me power*.....2 Or, *proclamation*.

as his friend, even as a witness in his behalf. The annals of persecution under Nero may well suggest the fearful danger of him who should publicly appear in behalf of a Christian, especially of one so distinguished as Paul. The most cruel tortures, the most terrible forms of death, were inflicted on the hated sect. The noble apostle thus stood absolutely friendless and forsaken before the imperial court. Compare the similar abandonment, in time of danger and calamity, of Job (19:13-17), of David, (Ps. 38:2; 41:9; 55:12-14), and of Christ himself (Matt. 26:56). **I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge**—"may God forgive them, as I do!" Grievous as was the wrong done to him, great as was the sin they thus committed against God, he prays that the Lord will not account it to them. He sees the magnitude of the danger to which such an exhibition of their friendship will expose them, and his generous heart forgives their weakness. (Luke 23:34; Acts 7:60.)

17. Notwithstanding the Lord stood with me and strengthened me—or, "supplied me with inward strength." (Phil. 4:13; 1 Tim. 1:12.) Forsaken by all earthly friends, he was not alone. There was One beside him—invisible, indeed, to that haughty Roman Court, but absolutely real and visible to the inward sense of the undefended, deserted prisoner; and from this glorious Presence he received a more than mortal strength in all the faculties of his soul. He was filled with a power that lifted him above fear, inspired holy boldness, suggested thoughts and words, and clothed the whole man with a divine energy which his enemies could not resist. Christ's words were fulfilled in him: "Ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles. But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak: for it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." (Matt. 10:18-20.) The great promise was verified: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Man may forsake us, but God never forsakes his people. (Ps. 27:10; Isa. 43:1, 2.) **That by me the preaching might be fully known, and that all the Gentiles might hear**—that is, that, being thus filled with divine power, he might be able, in the presence of the Roman Court and of the vast assembly of representative men of all nations gathered there, to declare fully the gospel message. It is not of himself the apostle thinks, even in this supreme moment of danger; but, as at Cesarea before Felix, and before Festus and Agrippa, so here before the imperial court at Rome, he uses the occasion less for a mere personal defense than for the proclamation of the saving truths of the gospel, which the Lord had committed to him. Thus, in one of those great basilicas in the Roman Forum, the blessed words of the divine salvation rang out in the ears of the noblest in Rome, and of multitudes from all parts of the empire, to most of whom the glad tidings of God's rich grace in Christ were then first published. 'The preaching might be fully known.' "It is his defense in the capital of the world, the representative of the nations, before the supreme tribunal and the encircling multitude of people, which Paul regards as the crown and consummation of his apostolic preaching, and as preaching in the hearing of all nations." (Wiesinger.) Compare Acts 9:15; 26:16. **And I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.** What lion? Several answers are given: 1. Nero, who in his brutal rage and cruelty is compared to this ravenous beast. 2. The lions of the amphitheatre, to which Paul was in danger of being thrown, but from which he was saved by establishing his Roman citizenship. 3. The danger in which he had stood of conviction and condemnation to death, from which he had been saved by his acquittal. Thus David, when in danger and calamity, prays: "Save me from the lion's mouth" (Ps. 22:21; 35:17), a figure often recurring in Scripture (Ps. 57:4; Jer. 51:38; Hosea 11:10). An obvious objection, however, to all these explanations, is that the apostle, in the next verse, expresses confidence that he will still experience similar deliver-

18 And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve *me* unto his heavenly kingdom: to whom *be* glory for ever and ever. Amen.
19 Salute Prisca and Aquila, and the household of Onesiphorus.
20 Erastus abode at Corinth: but Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick.

18 livered out of the mouth of the lion. The Lord will deliver me from every evil work, and will save me unto his heavenly kingdom: to whom *be* the glory [1] for ever and ever. Amen.
19 Salute Prisca and Aquila, and the house of Onesi-
20 phorus. Erastus abode at Corinth: but Trophimus

1 Gr. *unto the ages of the ages.*

ance, whereas it is plain from ver. 6–8, that he did not expect to be delivered from death, but believes that his martyrdom at the hands of his enemies is imminent. 4. Others, therefore, regard the word as referring to Satan (Luke 22 : 31; 1 Peter 5 : 8), and the danger from which he was rescued as the temptation to deny Christ, or, at least, to shrink in that great Presence from a full confession of him. From this temptation he was delivered, and he received strength to make a bold and clear confession of his Lord before that heathen assembly; though he stood there alone, uncheered by a single sympathizing face and in imminent peril of death. This last interpretation seems to me the most natural one, as well as the most consonant with the context.

18. And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work. He is fully assured of like deliverance from temptation to sin, even to the end. 'Evil work'—not injury done to him by others,—it is plain he did not expect deliverance from this,—but sin done by himself, such as that of denying Christ, from which he had just been delivered. He is sure the Lord will to the end strengthen him to maintain the good confession. Thus Chrysostom, Beza, Grotius, De Wette, Alford, Fausset, and others. "Experience brings hope with it; he who has been so often in peril, and has been saved—who feels, too, every day the saving help—can surely be of good hope that the Lord will always save him." (Hedinger.) **And will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom.** The Lord's grace will not fail him, but in every temptation will preserve him till he reaches the heavenly kingdom. This is an assured hope, but it is based, not on his own strength, or the maturity of his Christian growth, but only on the Lord's faithfulness and power. "The very *hope* produces a doxology; how much greater the doxology which the actual *enjoyment* shall produce!" (Bengel.) **To whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen**—a doxology to Christ, which in Paul has the parallels, Rom. 9 : 5; Heb. 13 : 21; and in other Scriptures. See 1 Peter 4 : 11; 2 Peter 3 : 18; Rev. 1 : 6. A doxology to the Father, similar in form, is found in Gal. 1 : 5; Phil. 4 : 20; such a doxology to any mere created being would surely be impious; and its use, here and elsewhere, demonstrates the supreme divinity of Christ.

19-22. VARIOUS SALUTATIONS, WITH A CLOSING BENEDICTION.

19. Salute Prisca and Aquila. Prisca, or Priscilla, was the wife of Aquila, of Pontus. Paul met them first at Corinth, whither they had come from Rome after the decree of Claudius expelling the Jews from that city, and where Paul, being of the same trade, wrought with them at tent making. They accompanied him to Ephesus, where, after Paul's departure, they met the eloquent Alexandrian, Apollos, and "expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly." (Acts 18 : 2, 18, 26.) When the apostle wrote First Corinthians they were with him at Ephesus, where, it seems, they had a house of their own and were then residing. (1 Cor. 16 : 19.) They are afterward mentioned as at Rome (Rom. 16 : 3), but must now have returned to Ephesus. "Here, also, as it often occurs, Prisca is named before her husband. It may perhaps be considered a proof that she was his superior, either as regards character or in respect to the development of her spiritual life." (Van Oosterzee.) **And the household of Onesiphorus.** He is mentioned, ch. 1 : 16, as having shown special kindness to Paul, who invokes mercy on his house. The supposition that Onesiphorus himself was dead, because Paul salutes only his household, is wholly unnecessary, since the apostle may have known that he was then absent from Ephesus, and therefore omitted salutation to him. These salutations to Prisca and Aquila, and to the house of Onesiphorus, make it well nigh certain that the Epistle was directed to Timothy when at Ephesus.

20. Erastus abode (*remained*) **at Corinth.** While Paul was in Ephesus he sent on

21 Do thy diligence to come before winter. Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens, and Linus, and Claudia, and all the brethren.
22 The Lord Jesus Christ *be* with thy spirit. Grace *be* with you. Amen.

21 I left at Miletus sick. Do thy diligence to come before winter. Eubulus saluteth thee, and Pudens, and Linus, and Claudia, and all the brethren.
22 The Lord be with thy spirit. Grace be with you.

Erastus with Timothy to Macedonia (Acts 19 : 22); and in Rom. 16 : 23 greeting is sent by an Erastus, described as "chamberlain," or financial administrator, of Corinth. Probably the latter is meant here, but certainty is unattainable. **But Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick.** He was an Ephesian, and had accompanied the apostle from Corinth to Jerusalem on the third missionary journey (Acts 20 : 4; 21 : 29), where his presence proved the innocent occasion of the assault on Paul in the temple. These notices plainly show that Paul had lately been at Corinth and Miletus—a fact wholly inconsistent with the writing of this Epistle during the Roman imprisonment recorded in Acts, at which time five, and probably six years, must have passed since he had visited those cities. 'Left . . . sick.' This, with other instances of unhealed sickness in Paul himself and his friends, clearly shows that miracles of healing were not wrought at the mere will, even of an apostle; they were doubtless exceptional manifestations of divine power, made only as the Holy Spirit directed and empowered him who performed them.

21. Do thy diligence to come before winter. Probably because travel would then be dangerous, if not impossible, and because any delay might make him too late to see the apostle before his martyrdom. Voyages on the Mediterranean were not usually made in winter, but vessels sought some harbor for wintering. (Acts 27 : 9-12.) Whether this last wish of the apostle was gratified, and the closing hours of his life were comforted by the presence of his dearest earthly friend, we are left wholly uncertain. Tradition states that Paul suffered martyrdom in the reign of Nero, who died in June, A. D. 68; and that his death was by decapitation, outside the walls of the city, on the *Via Ostia*, at a spot now called *Tre Fontane*, not far from which rises the magnificent basilica which bears his name. **Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens, and Linus, and Claudia.** The persons here named are not otherwise known, but doubtless they were Christians of distinction at Rome. Pudens and Claudia have, on very doubtful data, been identified as a Roman noble and a British princess, who were converted at Rome, were married, and died in the British Isles. (See Excursus to the Prolegomena on this Epistle in Alford, as also note *in loco* in Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of St. Paul.") Linus may possibly be the person mentioned by Irenæus as the first bishop of Rome.

22. The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit. This is personal, as the prayer of the apostle for Timothy. It invokes on him the highest possible blessing—Christ abiding as an ever manifested Presence with Timothy's spirit. (Gal. 6 : 18; Philem. 25.) The **grace** (of God) **be with you. Amen.** Here in the invocation he unites with Timothy those also who are with him, perhaps the church at Ephesus; and for them the prayer invokes all that is comprehended in the grace, or free favor, of God, the infinite blessings of salvation and eternal life.

The subscription, "The second epistle unto Timotheus," etc., as the subscription to other epistles, has no authority. The statement in it that Timothy was "ordained the first bishop of the church of the Ephesians" is plainly contradicted by the Epistle itself, where he ever appears, not as a bishop, but as an evangelist and as an apostolic assistant. Of a diocesan bishop at Ephesus, or anywhere else, the New Testament furnishes no trace; and the existence of such an office in the apostolic churches is an assumption at variance with the plain fact that in Scripture "bishop" and "elder" are interchangeable terms, designating one and the same office. See Acts 20 : 17, 28; Titus 1 : 5–7; 1 Peter 5 : 1, 2.

INTRODUCTION TO THE EPISTLE TO TITUS.

SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF TITUS.

The name of Titus does not occur in the Acts; we know him only from the Epistles. To explain this, it has been conjectured that Titus is the same person as Silas, or Sylvanus. To this, however, it seems an insuperable objection, that Silas, as a deputy from the church at Jerusalem to the church at Antioch, was most probably a Jew, or, if of Gentile origin, was at least a circumcised person; whereas Titus was a Gentile and uncircumcised. He is commonly supposed to belong to Antioch in Syria, and was probably converted under Paul's ministry, as the apostle calls him his "own son after the common faith." (1 : 4.) For he went up with Paul to Jerusalem, when a delegation from Antioch was sent thither on the question of Gentile circumcision; and it was here the apostle refused to yield to the demand of the Judaizers for his circumcision, apparently making the case of Titus, as an uncircumcised Gentile Christian, a test, the decision of which would plainly prove Gentile freedom from the bondage of Judaism. (Gal 2 : 1–3.) Nothing further is known of him until, on Paul's third missionary journey, during the long residence at Ephesus, Titus is sent from that city to Corinth, to ascertain the state of the church there, and especially the effect on them of the apostle's first epistle, sent to them not long before. He was well received at Corinth, and his labors there were productive of much good. (2 Cor. 7 : 13–15.) Paul, on leaving Ephesus, expected to meet Titus at Troas; and not finding him there, in his great anxiety for intelligence from Corinth, he hastened to Macedonia to meet him. (2 Cor. 2 : 13.) Thither at length Titus came, and, reporting the condition of the Corinthian Church, greatly relieved the apostle's heart. (2 Cor. 7 : 6, 7.) Paul then wrote his second epistle to Corinth, and, intrusting it to Titus, sent him again to that city, with "the brother whose praise is in all the churches," to hasten the collection "for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem." (2 Cor. 8 : 6, 16–23.) At what time he went with Paul to Crete is not fully settled; but, as before shown, it was probably near the close of Paul's life. When the apostle left the island, he left Titus there to complete the work begun, especially in giving additional organization to the churches, and correcting false tendencies; and after his departure, he wrote to him this Epistle, both as attesting his authority to act in the apostle's stead, and as directing Titus in the responsible work committed to him. Whether, as the Epistle directs, he met Paul the following winter in Nicopolis, is unknown. The only further notice of him is in the apostle's last epistle. (2 Tim. 4 : 10.) When, writing of his lonely position as a prisoner in Rome, he speaks of Titus as "departed to Dalmatia," sent, as we may hope, by the apostle himself on some mission for the gospel.

Tradition, as usual, has sought to fill up the gaps of history, and, in the hierarchical interest, has made him, "the first bishop of Crete," of which the Epistle furnishes no evidence whatever. Alford well remarks: "Not the slightest trace is found in the Epistle of any intention on the part of Paul to place Titus permanently over the Cretan churches;

indeed, such a view is inconsistent with the data furnished us in it." The Epistle plainly represents him, as in the case of Timothy, simply as an evangelist, acting as Paul's assistant, and temporarily left in Crete, in the apostle's place, to complete a service which Paul himself was not able to finish by reason of exigencies calling him elsewhere. Tradition also depicts him, in glowing colors, as the apostle of the gospel to Dalmatia, and as then taking up his abode in Crete, where he lived to a good old age, and died in great honor; of all which we have no trace either in authentic history or in archæological remains.

THE TIME AND OCCASION OF WRITING.

The date of the Epistle, as already shown, must probably be placed about A. D. 66, or 67, near the close of the apostle's life. The correspondencies in style and in the state of Christianity, as seen in the Pastoral Epistles, compel us to refer them to the same period. Where it was written, remains uncertain; it is variously referred to Macedonia and to Ephesus.

The island of Crete, or Candia, covers the southern entrance of the Archipelago, extending in length about one hundred and fifty miles, from Cape Salmone, on the east, to Cape Criumetopon, on the west; but in width varying from six to thirty-five miles. It is rocky and mountainous, with fertile valleys, producing cotton, olives, grapes, oranges, lemons, silk, and wool. The lofty form of Mount Ida appears about the middle of the island, rising to the height of seven thousand six hundred and seventy-four feet. Anciently Crete was crowded with cities and covered with a dense population, estimated at one million two hundred thousand. At present, its chief city is Candia, and the whole population of the island is about two hundred and ten thousand.

Crete is celebrated in ancient mythology especially as the place where Jupiter was born and buried. In the Trojan war, Idomeneus, king of Crete, embarked his troops in a fleet of eighty vessels, and led them in the long conflict. At a later period its chief cities became centres of little republics. The Cretan constitution and laws, originated by Minos, are said to have been the model from which many features of the constitution and laws of Lycurgus were derived. The island was subjected to Rome by Metellus, B. C. 67, and, at the time of Paul, was united to Cyrenaica, on the African coast opposite, forming one Roman province. In Paul's voyage to Rome, the vessel, sailing round Cape Salmone and under the lee of the island, reached Fair Havens, a harbor near the city of Lasea; and then, loosing thence, it attempted to reach Phenice, a port near the western end of the island. But a typhoon, rushing furiously down from Mount Ida, drove the ship out to sea, and after many days it grounded, a hopeless wreck, on the coast of Malta. The circumstances of Paul on this voyage plainly forbid the supposition that he performed much, if any, evangelical labor in Crete at this time.

Philo and Josephus both testify to the large number of Jews in Crete. Some of these were present in Jerusalem at the Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit was given, and these received the gospel. It seems probable, therefore, that Christianity had been introduced into the island from this source before the visit of Paul. The gospel thus brought, however, would be in a very imperfect form, mixed with much misconception and error; and, coming through a wholly Jewish channel, the errors would be largely Jewish in character. Christianity, as thus introduced, would also be very imperfectly organized. The apostle, at his coming, would naturally seek to remedy these defects by a more complete unfolding of the gospel and a more perfect organization of the churches.

But the character of the Cretans, and especially of the Cretan Jews, rendered the task one of great difficulty. As a people they were noted for their fickleness, avarice, sensuality, licentiousness, and mendacity; and they are thus characterized by even the heathen writers of that period. For some reason Paul is compelled to leave while in the midst of the work, and the difficult and delicate task of completing it was devolved on Titus. Consequently, the apostle, after his departure, writes this Epistle, at once to certify the authority of Titus as acting in the apostle's place in the superintendence of the work in Crete, and to give explicit directions to him respecting the manner of performing the duties of his position. In this, as in the Epistles to Timothy, the subjects treated belong, for the most part, to all ages, and have therefore a universal interest and importance. The Epistle was probably sent by the hands of Zenas and Apollos, to whom it served as a letter of introduction and commendation. (3 : 13.) Some, as Hofmann, regard this as the primary occasion of sending it; but, as these persons are not mentioned till the close of the Epistle, and then only in a single verse, it seems more natural to think that Paul was moved to write it by the needs of Titus and the Cretan Christians, and simply availed himself of the journey of Zenas and Apollos as a favoring opportunity to send it to the island.

THE CONTENTS.

Like the other Pastoral Epistles, this is a personal, familiar letter, and is without formal plan. The leading topics occur in the following order:

Chapter First.—Address and greeting (1–4); directions to Titus as to church order, particularly the qualifications of elders (10–16); the Cretan false teachers described (5–9).

Chapter Second.—Titus is instructed how to apply the gospel to different classes in the church, as the aged, the young, and the slaves (1–10); the ground of the foregoing exhortations to holy living is shown in that the grace of God has for its end the sanctification of men (11–15).

Chapter Third.—The conduct to be required of Christians toward rulers and society in general (1, 2); the duty of showing such disposition and conduct toward others is enforced and illustrated by God's kindness and mercy to us (3–7); the doctrine of a gratuitous salvation is to be insisted on in order to incite believers to good works (8–11); closing directions and salutations, with the benediction (12–15.)

THE EPISTLE TO TITUS.

CHAPTER I.

PAUL, a servant of God, and an apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of God's elect, and the acknowledging of the truth which is after godliness;
2 In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began;

1 Paul, a [1] servant of God, and an apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of God's elect, and the knowledge of the truth which is according to godli-
2 ness, in hope of eternal life, which God, who cannot

1 Gr. *bondservant.*

Ch. 1 : 1-4. ADDRESS AND SALUTATION. —1. After announcing himself as a servant of God and an apostle of Christ, he states that the object of his apostleship is to bring God's elect to the faith and to the full knowledge of the truth which leads to piety. (1.) 2. This object he prosecutes in view of the hope, for himself and all believers, of eternal life, which God, who cannot prove false, promised in Christ before eternal ages, but manifested in his own appointed times through preaching; which preaching, the apostle declares, was intrusted to him by the appointment of God. (2, 3.) 3. Addressing Titus as his true child in virtue of a common faith, he invokes on him grace and peace from God and Christ. (4.)

1. Paul a servant of God—an expression not elsewhere used by the apostle in opening his epistles, the more usual form being "a servant of Jesus Christ"; the fact may, perhaps, serve to attest the genuineness of the Epistle, since a forger would not be likely to depart from Paul's method in so conspicuous a place. **And an apostle of Jesus Christ**—presenting the special office and work of Paul as an apostle in distinction from his general position as a servant. **According to the faith of God's elect and the acknowledging** (*knowledge*) **of the truth, which is after godliness**—"with a view to subserve the faith of God's elect." Compare Rom. 1 : 5: "for obedience to the faith." Here the object of the apostleship is stated: it is to bring God's chosen to the faith and to the full knowledge of that truth which leads to godliness. (Acts 13 : 48; 18 : 9, 10.) This, which was pre-eminently the end of the apostolic office, is the grand end of the ministry; for preaching is God's appointed means of faith. (Rom. 10 : 14-17; 1 Cor. 1 : 21-24.) 'God's elect,' or, "the chosen of God." "Acts 13 : 48 shows this — that election is not in consequence of faith, but faith in consequence of election. Compare Eph. 1 : 4." (Ellicott.) Though God's elect, their election only attains its end "through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth" (2 Thess. 2 : 13); and hence the gospel must be proclaimed, and they must believe, in order to be saved (2 Tim. 2 : 10). The truth is 'after (or, *according*) to godliness'—that is, it is not merely abstract, theoretical; but has a moral aim, leading men to practical godliness. It is not a mere philosophy, but a spiritual power, purifying and uplifting the life.

2. In hope of eternal life—"he fulfills his task with or in hope of eternal life." That which he has in view in prosecuting the work of his apostleship is the hope, for himself and for all believers, of eternal life. This is the glorious goal set before him, and which, in leading men to faith and the full knowledge of the truth, he sets before them—eternal life secured in Christ. Faith and knowledge, in his view, "rested on a background of promise and hope, which, in a manner, stretched from eternity to eternity, having God's primeval promise for its origin, and a participation in his everlasting life for an end." (Fairbairn.) **Which** (eternal life) **God that cannot lie, promised before the world began** (*eternal times*)—that is, as 2 Tim. 1 : 9, before the cycles, or ages, through which the world has passed, commenced; or in eternity, before time began. 'Cannot lie'—a single word in the Greek (ἀψευδής), added to heighten the certainty of the result, as Heb. 6 : 18; compare Rom. 3 : 4; 11 : 29; 1 Cor. 1 : 9. The unchanging truth of God is the foundation of all hope. *Promised before eternal times*—as "chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world" (Eph. 1 : 4), God gave the elect, in solemn promise, to Christ as his redeemed people

3 But hath in due times manifested his word through preaching, which is committed unto me according to the commandment of God our Saviour;
4 To Titus, *mine* own son after the common faith: Grace, mercy, *and* peace, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour.

3 lie, promised [1] before times eternal; but in [2] his own seasons manifested his word in the [3] message wherewith I was intrusted according to the command-
4 ment of God our Saviour; to Titus, my true child after a common faith: Grace and peace from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Saviour.

1 Or, *long ages ago*.....2 Or, *its*.....3 Or, *proclamation*.

and as co-inheritors with him of eternal life. (John 6 : 39; 10 : 29; 17 : 2, 6, 8, 11.) This promise, made to Christ in eternity is assured by the unchanging faithfulness of God; and resting on it as an absolute certainty, the apostle prosecuted his apostolic work, and to that promise directed the faith and hope of men. "If indeed Christ be 'the chosen of God,' the Surety and Representative of 'all who were given to him' (John 6 : 36-40; 17 : 1-3), eternal life was promised to him 'before the world was,' in consequence of his engagement to become incarnate and to be obedient even to the death of the cross." (Scott.) Others explain it as "a contracted expression for '*purposed* before the world began' (literally, before *the ages of time*), and *promised* actually in time, the promise springing from the eternal purpose." (Fausset.) Thus, also, Alford and most interpreters.

3. But hath in due times manifested his word through preaching—or, *manifested in his own* (appointed) *times his word in the proclamation.* (Acts 1 : 7; 1 Tim. 6 : 15.) His word of promise of eternal life, made to Christ before eternal ages and hid through those ages in the mystery of the divine counsels, God manifested, published, in his own appointed times, "when the fulness of time was come" —that is, in the Gospel Dispensation. "Here again we have the same antithesis between the period of the revealed and the hidden mystery, as in Rom. 16 : 25; Eph. 3 : 5. The time of this revelation is that which God fixed and arranged in his own wisdom. See, also, 1 Tim. 2 : 6; Gal. 4 : 4." (Van Oosterzee.) **Which is committed unto me.** The proclamation, or preaching, with which Paul was charged, was the vehicle, or medium, through which this great promise of eternal life in Christ was manifested or published. The proclaiming of this he everywhere regards as his special trust from God. See Acts 20 : 24; 1 Cor. 9 : 16, 17; 2 Cor. 5 : 18-20; Gal. 1 : 15, 16; 1 Tim. 1 : 11. **According to the commandment of God our Saviour.** He did not preach on his own authority, but as one intrusted with a proclamation by the appointment of God. 'God our Saviour'—probably God the Father, according to the prevailing Pauline usage. (1 Tim. 1 : 1; 2 : 3; Titus 2 : 10; 3 : 4; Jude 25.)

4. To Titus, mine own son after the common faith—or, *in virtue of a common faith.* '*Mine own*,' *genuine.* (1 Tim. 1 : 2.) He was Paul's genuine son; by virtue, not of fleshly relationship, but of their sharing in a common faith. He was Paul's spiritual child, probably as having been led to Christ by him and as having thus been made a sharer of his faith. (1 Cor. 4 : 15; Philem. 10.) Titus was a Gentile; and in 'common faith' there is possibly allusion to the higher bond of unity by which this common faith in Christ bound them, though one was a Jew and the other a Gentile. (Gal. 5 : 6; Col. 3 : 11.) **Grace, mercy, and peace.** 'Mercy,' which occurs in the other Pastoral Epistles, is probably to be omitted here, as it is wanting in the Sinaitic, Ephraem, and other ancient codices, as also in important versions. It was probably interpolated to conform the passage to the others. (1 Tim. 1 : 2; 2 Tim. 1 : 3.) It is found, however, in the Alexandrian Codex. **From God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour.** 'Our Saviour,' used here only of Christ in an invocation, though often applied to him in other relations. "He applies the same epithet, *Saviour*, to the Father and to Christ, inasmuch as certainly each of them is our Saviour, but for a different reason; for the Father is our Saviour because he redeemed us by the death of his Son, that he might make us heirs of eternal life; but the Son, because he shed his blood as the pledge and price of our salvation. Thus the Son has brought to us salvation from the Father, and the Father has bestowed it through the Son." (Calvin.)

5-9. The Appointment of Elders; Qualifications to be Required in them. —1. The apostle's purpose in leaving Titus in Crete; it was that he should further set in

5 For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee:

5 For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that were wanting, and appoint elders in every city, as I gave thee

order the churches, especially by the appointment of elders. (6.) 2. He prescribes the qualifications which must be required in elders, mentioning (*a*) the moral, or those pertaining to the character and life, and (*b*) the doctrinal, insisting especially on adherence to the sure, divinely taught word as necessary alike in exhorting believers and in convicting opposers. (6–9.)

5. For this cause left I thee in Crete. This large and populous island, the southernmost in the Grecian Archipelago, is now called Candia. Paul had labored here with Titus, but being obliged to leave, perhaps by the urgency of work in other fields, he left his assistant in the island to carry to completion the work they had begun. Of the time when this occurred we have no information; but as no allusion is made in the Acts to this visit to Crete, and as the style of the Epistle and the general circumstances indicated in it correspond in a remarkable manner to the First Epistle to Timothy, it must probably be referred to the same period, perhaps about A. D. 66 or 67. 'Left I thee' (behind). The expression does not imply the permanence of Titus' position there, but the reverse; and lends, therefore, no sanction to the tradition that Titus was "first bishop of the church of the Cretians," a wholly unfounded assumption. In fact, Titus was to remain there only till the coming fall or winter, and then come to Paul at Nicopolis (3:12), from which last place he probably accompanied the apostle to Rome, and thence went, not to Crete again, but to Dalmatia (2 Tim. 4:10). There is no evidence whatever, in or out of Scripture, that Titus was ever again in Crete. **That thou shouldest** (further) **set in order the things that are wanting.** Christianity had probably been introduced on the island a number of years before. Some Cretans had been present at the Pentecost. (Acts 2:11) Paul had stopped in Crete on his voyage to Rome (Acts 27:8, 9.) It is likely, therefore, that Christians were living there; but the gospel, received in this incidental way, must have been very imperfectly understood. The churches, in their doctrinal knowledge, Christian life, and church organization, must have been far from complete, and must have required much additional instruction and training. This work Paul had begun, but, being called away, had left Titus behind to carry to completion.

And ordain (*appoint*) **elders in every city.** This was one of the "things that were wanting." There were Christian assemblies, doubtless with incipient forms of organization; but the churches needed to be fully organized and officered. The gospel becomes a permanent and aggressive power on earth only through the church, the divinely constituted organization, to which God has committed it, and through which it is appointed to act on men. The pietism which, in the professed interest of spiritual religion, undervalues the outward institutions of the gospel, finds no sanction in Scripture; on the contrary, the church, with its heaven-given ministry and ordinances, there stands in the foreground as God's agency for the conservation of his truth and the conversion of the world. (Matt. 18:15-17; Acts 14:23; Eph. 4:11, 12; 1 Tim. 3:15.) 'Ordain elders.' The word *ordain* here does not signify, as it is now technically used, to set apart for the ministry by an ordaining service, but simply to *institute, appoint.* How the elders were selected is not stated. In Acts 6:3, the selection of the Seven was made by the whole body of the disciples, and the appointment, or public setting apart to the office, was by the apostles. Thus also in Acts 14:23, Paul and Barnabas "ordained them elders in every church," where the word rendered *ordained* denotes "to appoint by causing to stretch forth the hand," and the meaning, according to Alford, Lange, Alexander, Barnes, and all the early English versions, is "ordained them elders by election in every congregation." In all cases of the appointment of church officers in the New Testament, so far as the process is indicated, the selection was made by the whole body of believers, and the formal setting apart was the function of the ministry. (Acts 1:15-26; 1 Cor. 16:3.) 'In every city,' or, *city by city.* Here was no diocesan episcopacy, but the church in every city has its own body of elders, each of whom is called in ver. 7 *bishop* (ἐπίσκοπος). **As I had appointed thee**—referring to directions orally given before the

6 If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children not accused of riot or unruly.
7 For a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God; not selfwilled, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre;

6 charge; if any man is blameless, the husband of one wife, having children that believe, who are not
7 accused of riot or unruly. For the [1] bishop must be blameless, as God's steward; not selfwilled, not soon angry, [1] no brawler, no striker, not greedy of filthy

1 Or, *overseer*.....2 Or, *not quarrelsome over wine.*

apostle left Crete. These directions required him not only to appoint elders in every city, but also to see that only persons of suitable character were appointed, men possessing the qualifications here mentioned. It is evident from this that not only were churches of divine institution, but also their organization took form in accordance with express divine directions. (1 Cor. 4 : 17; 7 : 17; 1 Tim. 3 : 1-7.) Plainly, therefore, in the absence of inspired authorization of change, the constitution and order of the church, with its ministry and ordinances, remain the same as instituted by the apostles, and are of permanent obligation.

6. If any be blameless—unaccused, and giving no occasion for accusation. (1 Tim. 3 : 10.) Moral qualifications are made in the New Testament of pre-eminent moment in the candidate for the ministry, because religious power depends on these. (1 Tim. 3 : 7.) "This first word shows what in the apostle's estimate was mainly to be looked to; it is the moral estimation in which the person to be selected was held, the reputation which he had among men, on which above all he lays stress. For an efficient discharge of the duties of the office can be conceived of only on the supposition of a good reputation." (Wiesinger.) **The husband of one wife**—not having more than one living wife; of irreproachable marital relations. See note 1 Tim. 3 : 2. **Having faithful children**—that is, those that are not only Christians, but are also orderly, consistent Christians, as the following context suggests. "Having a family well governed and well trained in religion." **Not accused of riot or unruly**—or, *who* (the children) *are not under accusation of profligacy, or of living riotously.* (Luke 15 : 13; Eph. 5 : 18; 1 Peter 4 : 4.) 'Or unruly'—disobedient to parents, or to constituted authority. On this qualification in the presbyter's family, see 1 Tim. 3 : 4. Inability to train and govern a family creates a presumption of inability to train and govern the church.

7. For—reason for the above qualifications in the fact that he is God's steward. **The bishop**—or, *overseer.* He who is here called *bishop* (ἐπίσκοπος) is plainly one of those called *elders* (πρεσβυτέροι) in ver. 5, the latter being the Hebrew and the former the Greek designation of the one officer. See the two words used interchangeably also. (Acts 20 : 17, 28; 1 Peter 5 : 1, 2.) "Hence it is evident they named the presbyters bishops." (Theodoret.) 'Bishop'—"here most plainly identified with the presbyters spoken of before." (Alford.) **Must be blameless as the steward of God**—that is, because he is God's steward. The pastor, as proclaiming the divine offers of mercy, is a dispenser of God's rich grace to men, and a minister for God in the church. Standing in a position so exalted and responsible, the nature of his office requires that he be unaccused and unaccusable. (Heb. 3 : 2-6; 1 Peter 4 : 10, 17.) "The greater the Master is, the greater should be his servant's virtues." (Bengel.) 'Steward'—one appointed by God over his house or family, the church. For the pastor, though chosen by the church, is not merely the servant of the church, but receives his appointment from God, and is 'the steward of God,' acting in his office by divine authority, and dispensing from God the bread of life to the people. (Luke 12 : 42; 1 Cor. 4 : 1, 2; 1 Tim. 3 : 15.) **Not selfwilled**—not arbitrary, one who insists on having his own way. (2 Peter 2 : 10.) "Describing a self-loving spirit, which in seeking only to gratify itself is regardless of others." (Ellicott.) **Not soon angry**—not irascible, quick tempered, hasty in anger. **Not given to wine**—literally, *not with wine.* In a secondary sense, *one under the influence of wine*, and then, *one who acts with violence induced by wine; a brawler.* The word, if not absolutely prohibitory of wine, certainly requires temperance in the use of it. **No striker**—a violent man, one given to acts of bodily violence. **Not given to filthy lucre**—not one who would use the office for the accumulation of wealth, or "filthy lucre." (Ver. 11; 1 Tim. 6 : 5; 1 Peter 5 : 2.)

8 But a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate:
9 Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.

8 lucre; but given to hospitality, a lover of good,
9 soberminded, just, holy, temperate; holding to the faithful word which is according to the teaching, that he may be able both to exhort in the [1]sound [2]doctrine, and to convict the gainsayers.

1 Gr. *healthful*.....2 Or, *teaching*.

8. But a lover of hospitality. He now passes to the positive qualities required in a pastor; and first *hospitable*, as over against the narrow, sordid spirit which would grudge the expense of hospitality—a service specially necessary in that age, when the Christian traveler was exposed to peculiar difficulties and dangers, and a duty, therefore, which was often insisted on. See Rom. 12 : 13; 1 Tim. 3 : 2; Heb. 13 : 2; 1 Peter 4 : 9: 3 John 5. **A lover of good men**—including, probably, all goodness, wherever found, whether in men or in deeds and things. (Phil. 4 : 8, 9.) **Sober**—having a sound, well-balanced mind, especially in practical life; "discreet," "self-restrained." **Just**—righteous, just as related to men; "upright in his dealings with all. A minister can do little good who is not." (Barnes.) **Holy**—*devoted to God, pure.* The three words, sober, just, holy, present the three sides of human duty—duty to one's self, duty to men, and duty to God; in all of these the minister is to show himself a true man. Compare ch. 2 : 12, where the three sides of life and character are similarly presented in the requirements to "live soberly and righteously and godly." **Temperate**—or, *self-restrained;* men who hold under control their bodily appetites and passions; it refers not to chastity alone, but self-restraint in all things. (1 Cor. 9 : 25.) Compare on this catalogue of qualifications for the ministry, 1 Tim. 3 : 2-7, where the list is almost identical.

9. Holding fast—holding as against opposition, adhering to it, notwithstanding temptation to abandon it. (Matt. 6 : 24.) **The faithful word**—the trustworthy word, the word deserving of confidence. (1 Tim. 1 : 15; 3 : 1; 4 : 9; 2 Tim. 2 : 2; 3 : 8.) **As he hath been taught**—or, *according to the teaching*—that is, the word which accords with the inspired teaching, the gospel as taught by the apostles. (2 Tim. 1 : 13; 3 : 14.) **That he may be able by sound doctrine** (*teaching*) **both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.** The apostle has in view the twofold duty of the pastor: first, to exhort believers, which exhortation is to be *in*—that is, *in the sphere of sound doctrine*, as its element; and second, to reason with and convict opposers. The ability of the minister for both these functions depends on his personal adherence to the gospel as taught by the apostles. In this he is to *stand fast.* "He is the true bishop who holds the true faith, and who properly uses his knowledge to edify the people, and check the wantonness of the adversaries." (Calvin.)

Note: The qualifications for the sacred office here required are, first, a sound moral character, healthy and symmetrical in its development, and strong in all the Christian virtues; and, second, a clear understanding and firm conviction of the Christian doctrines, with requisite ability and earnestness in teaching them. Without these qualifications, no man ought to be admitted to the ministry. It is the solemn duty of the church in electing to the ministerial office, and of the ordaining presbytery in setting apart to it, to ascertain the thorough soundness of the candidate in character and life, as well as in creed. No intellectual power or pulpit brilliancy can atone for the lack of solid Christian virtues and a blameless life.

10-16. NECESSITY OF SUCH QUALIFICATIONS IN THE PASTORS SHOWN FROM THE CHARACTER OF THE FALSE TEACHERS AND OF THE CRETANS IN GENERAL.—1. Many men have arisen who are insubordinate, vain-talkers, and deceivers, chiefly among professed converts from Judaism, and who must be silenced, since, by their false teaching, they are subverting whole families, for the sake of base gain. (10, 11.) 2. The Cretans are, in their general character, mendacious, brutal, and gluttonous, as he shows by the testimony of one of their own reputed prophets, which testimony he confirms as true: Titus is, therefore, to correct the people with severity, that they may possess moral health by means of the faith, and may not give heed to Jewish fables, and the commandments of men who turn away from the truth. (12-14.) 3. As these commandments of men enforced the

10 For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision:
11 Whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake.
12 One of themselves, *even* a prophet of their own, said, The Cretians *are* always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies.

10 For there are many unruly men, vain talkers, and
11 deceivers, specially they of the circumcision, whose mouths must be stopped; men who overthrow whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for
12 filthy lucre's sake. One of themselves, a prophet of their own, said, Cretans are always liars, evil beasts,

Jewish distinctions between outward things as clean and unclean, the apostle affirms that for the Christian no such distinctions exist, since purity and impurity, in any moral sense, do not belong to mere outward things, such as meats and drinks, but only to the soul. To the pure, therefore, all such things are pure, while to the impure nothing is, or can be, pure, since in them both mind and conscience are defiled; which also is seen in their character and conduct, since, while professing to know God, they practically deny him, being detestable in character, and morally incapable of any good work. (15, 16.)

10. For—he explains the necessity of these qualifications in the ministry, from the number and character of the opposers, referred to in the preceding verse, and especially from the character of the Cretans. **There are many unruly**—those who refuse subjection to church and pastoral authority and walk disorderly. The parties thus referred to seem to have been members of the church. **And vain talkers and deceivers**—men given to talk, making much of things of no moment, and seeking to deceive others. (3:9; 1 Tim. 1:6; 2 Tim. 3:13; Gal. 6:3.) **Specially they of the circumcision**—professed converts from Judaism, who insisted on the necessity of observing the Jewish ceremonial law, in addition to the precepts of the gospel. According to the testimony of Josephus and others, many Jews were at this time living in Crete, of whom doubtless numbers professed Christianity, or were in various ways connected with the (as yet) partially organized Christian assemblies.

11. Whose mouths must be stopped—be checked, or curbed, as an unruly beast is bridled, or muzzled. They were men who must be silenced by clear, conclusive, confutation and conviction, as Christ put to silence the Sadducees and Pharisees (Matt. 22:34, 46), and Paul confounded the Jews at Damascus. (Acts 9:22.) Compare 1 Tim. 1:3–7; 2 Tim. 3:1–9. **Who subvert whole houses**—or, *inasmuch as they are*, or, *as those who are*, subverting whole households. Reason why their mouths must be stopped: their slanderous accusations and false doctrines were producing disastrous effects, so that entire families were being perverted from the truth. (2 Tim. 2:18.) **Teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake.** The deceivers were, in this case, influenced, not by fanaticism or false zeal, but by sordid motives. Perhaps they made themselves popular by flattering Jewish prejudices, teaching the obligation of the Mosaic ceremonial law, and the superior dignity and privilege of those who could trace their genealogy back to Abraham; and thus secured a larger following and more ample support. (1 Tim. 3:3-8; 6:5.)

12. One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said—that is, one of the Cretans, of whose general characteristics, as a people, the apostle now speaks. He refers to Epimenides, of Gnossus, Crete, who lived about B. C. 600; a man of such distinction as a prophet and sage, that he is cited as an inspired man by Plato, Cicero, and other eminent writers. The first clause of the words here cited was found, also, in a hymn to Zeus by Callimachus, of Cyrene, B. C. 260. 'A prophet of their own'—that is, reputed among them as a prophet, and, being one of themselves, not likely to speak evil of them falsely. Paul quotes twice elsewhere from heathen authors (Acts 17:28; 1 Cor. 15:33), but nowhere mentions their names. **The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies.** *Evil beasts*—"rude, savage, cunning, greedy." 'Slow bellies,' or, *idle gluttons*, as in Revised Version, applied to persons who become corpulent through idleness and gluttony, and here directly designating the Cretans, because the belly was the chief object of their life. (Rom. 16:18; Phil. 3:19.) The character here given of the Cretans as a people is abundantly confirmed by Livy, Polybius, Plutarch, and Strabo, who testify to their mendacity, brutality, avarice, and idleness. The word, *To Cretize*, (κρητίζειν) signified among the ancients *to lie*, *to deceive*.

13 This witness is true. Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith;
14 Not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men, that turn from the truth.
15 Unto the pure all things *are* pure: but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving *is* nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled.

13 idle [1] gluttons. This testimony is true. For which cause reprove them sharply, that they may be
14 [2] sound in the faith, not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men who turn away
15 from the truth. To the pure all things are pure: but to them that are defiled and unbelieving nothing is pure; but both their mind and their conscience

1 Gr. *bellies*.....2 Gr. *healthy*.

13. This witness is true. The apostle confirms Epimenides' words, as justly characterizing the Cretans as a people. Doubtless there were many individual exceptions, but these characteristics belonged to them as a nation. **Wherefore rebuke them sharply**—rather, *convict them sharply*, with clear, decisive proofs, and earnest, authoritative manner; referring "not so much to the heretics as the Cretans, who were exposed to their misleading influences." Or, as Ellicott: "*Confute them, set them right, with severity;* not the deceivers so much as the deceived." **That they may be sound** (healthy) **in the faith**—that is, that they may be in moral health, in virtue of, or, by means of, the faith. The gospel alone can keep them in moral health; Titus must, therefore, use sharpness, severity, in confuting and convicting them when necessary, to prevent their deception and their perversion from the truth. 'In the faith'—"faith being the *sphere* which constitutes the centre and starting point of the entire internal and external life, and, therefore, if it is to be good, must be the seat of health." (Van Oosterzee.)

14. Not giving heed to Jewish fables. Precisely what these were, it is not easy to ascertain. They are referred to (1 Tim. 1:4; 4:4) as "fables and endless genealogies," "profane and old wives' fables." Here they are called "Jewish fables." Thus of Jewish origin, they were possibly those popular speculations as to angels and æons which, in a later age, took more clearly defined form as Gnosticism. Probably the deception ("always liars") which characterizes the Cretans, inclined them to these idle fables. 'Not giving heed': men have not only no right to receive error, but they are under obligation, also, to avoid it, to give no heed to it. It must be shunned as a temptation and snare. For theoretical error always, sooner or later, leads to practical error, sin in heart and life; and the only purifying power in character and action is that heart faith which clearly apprehends and receives the truth. **And commandments of men that turn from the truth.** These commands related to abstinence from meats and drinks, and other observances, which the ceremonial law once prescribed: but which, as that law had been abrogated by the gospel, could now rest only on the commandment of men. Such restrictions and observances, also, had been greatly increased by "the tradition of the elders." (Mark 7:1-13.) But all these, as obligations imposed on the conscience by man, were mere "will-worship," intruding on the prerogatives of God and offensive to him (Col. 2:20-23); while, as the apostle proceeds to show, such distinctions in merely outward things, as meats and drinks, had no basis in the nature of things.

15. Unto the pure all things are pure—that is, all the outward things referred to, such as meats and drinks, to which these distinctions of pure and impure were applied. Whether these things are for us clean or unclean, the apostle says, depends, not on the things, but on us; if we are pure inwardly, purified in heart by faith (Acts 15:9), then all these outward things are for us pure, and are fitted for our use. "There is nothing unclean in itself." (Rom. 14:14, 20; 1 Cor. 8:4-8.) Sin does not inhere in a thing, but in a moral personality; so that whether anything is for a man clean or unclean, depends on the heart of the man. "God made nothing unclean." (Chrysostom.) Thus Christ said: "There is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile him; but the things which come out of him, these are they that defile the man." (Mark 7:15; Matt. 15:10-20.) 'All things': not including, of course, willful error and acts forbidden by the moral law; the context plainly limits the words to things commonly regarded by Jews as ceremonially unclean, a distinction which had been done away, with the establishment of Christianity. (Acts 10:9-16.) **But unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure.** As it is the man and not the thing which determines its purity

16 They profess that they know God; but in works they deny *him*, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate.

16 are defiled. They profess that they know God; but by their works they deny him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate.

it follows that to the impure nothing can be pure. "They have within a fountain of pollution which spreads itself over and infects everything about them. Their food and drink, their possessions, their employments, their comforts, their actions—all are in the reckoning of God tainted with impurity, because they are putting away from them that which alone has for the soul regenerating and cleansing efficacy." (Fairbairn.) **But even (*both*) their mind and conscience is defiled.** 'Mind' (νοῦς), the intellectual, rational nature, but considered as that which, through the affections, determines the volitions. It thus practically "includes the willing as well as the thinking part of man." (Delitzsch.) 'Conscience' (συνείδησις), the moral, self-reflective nature, which cognizes right and wrong. The two united present "the life stream in its outflow and its inflow together." (Beck.) The whole inner life is defiled. "And, therefore, uncleanness tainting their rational acts and reflective self-recognitions, nothing can be pure to them; every occasion becomes to them an occasion of sin, every creature of God an instrument of sin; as Mack well observes, 'the relation in which the sinful subject stands to the objects of its possession, or of its inclination, is itself a sinful one.'" (Alford.) See this fearful fact, the universal sinfulness of the unconverted man, stated in still more profound and solemn form, in Rom. 8 : 7, 8: "The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can he. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." Compare Eph. 2 : 1–3; Prov. 15 : 8; 21 : 4.

Note: Here, as elsewhere, a pure faith is made the essential condition of a truly pure life. The truth, believingly apprehended, is that which makes the soul morally free. (John 8 : 31-36.) It renews the heart, the fountain of the moral life, and puts the man into living sympathy with God and with all that is true and pure and holy. (Rom. 6 : 2-11.) To such a soul, the things—mere meats and drinks, on which the Jews insisted as unclean—were not unclean: they did not and could not defile him. "But the principle 'to the pure all things are pure' may be sadly abused, unless it is explained and limited by the principle stated by the apostle in 1 Tim. 4 : 4, 5. Since no one is absolutely pure, and even the best men are exposed to various temptations, there are, in the case of every man, things which, though in themselves innocent, might better be avoided by *him*: hence conscientious, daily self-observation, which is often attended by self-mortifying experience, is necessary to make us observant of those breakers which specially threaten us." (Van Oosterzee.)

16. They profess that they know God. This is their public profession; and it is so far true, that they do in fact have an outward knowledge of him, in this differing from the heathen, and being thereby in greater condemnation. **But in their works they deny him.** Their conduct is at variance with their profession of the knowledge of God, for they live as though they knew him not. **Being abominable, and disobedient**—or, *since they are abominable*, etc. In character they are 'abominable,' vile and detestable before God; in life they are 'disobedient,' disobeying the precepts of God's law, and and rejecting the grace of his gospel. (Ezek. 33 : 31; 1 Tim. 5 : 8; 2 Tim. 3 : 5.) **And unto every good work reprobate.** 'Reprobate' (ἀδόκιμος) applies to one who has been repeatedly and fully tested, and, in the testing process, has proved worthless. So these for every good work had been proved worthless. The opportunities and incentives to good works had been set before them, but they had chosen rather the evil; they were now, therefore, 'reprobate,' given up, as proved worthless. (Rom. 1 : 28; 1 Cor. 9 : 27; 2 Cor. 13 : 5-7; Heb. 6 : 8.) Life in the church is a probation, in which character is tested, and where, alas! many fail. As Judas, even in the company of apostles, and under the personal instruction of Christ, developed only in his evil nature, and fitted himself for perdition, and as Ananias and Simon Magus (Acts 5 : 1; 8 : 18), though under apostolic teaching, only revealed the wickedness that was in them; so, in all ages, there are men in the churches to whom religious privileges only prove the means of

CHAPTER II.

BUT speak thou the things which become sound doctrine:
2 That the aged men be sober, grave, temperate, sound in faith, in charity, in patience.
3 The aged women likewise, that *they be* in behaviour as becometh holiness, not false accusers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things;

1 But speak thou the things which befit the [1] sound
2 [2] doctrine: that aged men be temperate, grave, sober-
3 minded, [3] sound in faith, in love, in [4] patience: that aged women likewise be reverent in demeanour, not slanderers nor enslaved to much wine, teachers

1 Gr. *healthful*.....2 Or, *teaching*.....3 Gr. *healthy*.....4 Or, *stedfastness*.

demonstrating their evil character, and the intellectual knowledge of God only serves to evoke their real hatred to him and to fit them for destruction. They "profess that they know God, but in works they deny him"; and at the last, though they say, "Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?" he will then say unto them, "I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity." (Matt. 7:15-27.)

Ch. 2: 1-10. TITUS DIRECTED HOW TO INSTRUCT DIFFERENT CLASSES OF PERSONS IN THE CHURCH.—Speaking the things that befit sound doctrine, he is charged to exhort: 1. Aged men, to a spirit and conduct befitting their age and experience. (2.) 2. Aged women, to a deportment such as becomes holy persons, that thus they may train the younger women in those virtues which shall confer blessing on the homes over which they preside. (3-5.) 3. The younger men, to sobermindedness; seeking, also, to influence them by the example of good works furnished in his own life, and by the sincerity, gravity, and soundness of his discourse, thus putting to shame opposers. (6-8.) 4. Slaves, also, to submission, cheerful obedience, and fidelity to their masters, whereby they will adorn the doctrine of our Saviour God. (9, 10.)

1. But speak thou. In contrast with the false teachers before described. **The things which become** (*befit the*) **sound doctrine**—or, *healthy instruction*, the precepts of the gospel, obedience to which gives moral health. The duties he is to inculcate are to be such as *befit, are agreeable to, sound doctrine*, the simple, pure gospel. The errorists, "teaching things which they ought not" (1:11), dealt in subjects morally unprofitable, producing no fruits in holy living, but mere word strifes, and profitless speculations. Titus, on the other hand, must enforce those solid virtues and practical duties which befit the gospel. These are indicated in what follows.

I. 2, 3. DUTIES OF THE AGED.

2. That the aged men be sober (circumspect)—literally, *temperate as it respects wine;* then, sober-minded, watchful in spirit and conduct. The word, doubtless, includes freedom from intemperance in strong drink, but here probably more than this, circumspection in all things. **Grave**—or, *dignified;* referring to their bearing and deportment, a manner befitting age and dignity. **Temperate.** In Revised Version, *sober-minded.* Involving the conception of a well-balanced, properly regulated mind. A person of discretion and sound judgment. (1:8; 1 Tim. 2:2.) **Sound** (healthy) **in faith, in love, in patience**—not morbid or fitful, in these qualities, but in the full, natural exercise of them. 'Patience,' or, enduring fortitude. Old age is the period of infirmities from the decay of the body, the season of loneliness from the loss of the friends of early life, who pass away by death; the age when life often seems a disappointment and failure, as one looks back on the unrealized hopes of youth. It is the blessed office of the religion of Christ at such a time to lift the soul above querulousness and murmuring and despair, and inspire it with patient resignation, heavenly fortitude, and ever brightening hope; and it is where this effect is produced in the actual life, the gospel shines forth in its highest glory before men. "Those who are full of years should be full of grace and goodness, the *inner man* renewing more and more as the *outer* decays." (Henry.)

3. The aged women likewise, that they be in behaviour as becometh holiness. A general characterization, of which the following are specific points: 'Behavior,' or, demeanor. The word includes all that in the appearance, bearing, deportment, which manifests the inner life. Their outward de-

4 That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children,
5 *To be* discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed.
6 Young men likewise exhort to be soberminded.
7 In all things shewing thyself a pattern of good works: in doctrine *shewing* uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity,
8 Sound speech, that cannot be condemned; that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of you.

4 of that which is good; that they may train the young women to love their husbands, to love their chil-
5 dren, *to be* soberminded, chaste, workers at home, kind, being in subjection to their own husbands,
6 that the word of God be not blasphemed: the
7 younger men likewise exhort to be soberminded: in all things shewing thyself an ensample of good works: in thy doctrine *shewing* uncorruptness,
8 gravity, sound speech, that cannot be condemned; that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed,

meanor should befit and attest a reverent and devout heart. "That their very gait and motions, their countenance, their speech, their silence, may carry in them a certain decorous and sacred dignity." (Jerome.) 'As becometh holiness'—or, holy-beseeming. Compare Eph. 5:3; 1 Tim. 2:10. **Not false accusers** (*slanderers*)—literally, *not devils;* calumniators, speaking evil of others. **Not given** (*enslaved*) **to much wine.** Forbidding bondage to the habit of using stimulants, a vice common among heathen women, and conspicuously so probably in Crete. (Rom. 6:16; 2 Peter 2:19; 1 Tim. 3:8, 11.) **Teachers of good things.** As the natural instructors of the younger women, they were to teach them, by precept and example, that which is good and useful. (Prov. 31:1, 26.)

II. 4–8. Duties of the Young, and of Titus as an Example.

4. That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children. *Teach . . . to be sober*, a single word in the Greek (σωφρονίζωσι)—literally, *make sober*, or *sober-minded*—then, train, or instruct with authority; probably used because of the authoritative relation of mothers to their daughters. The habitual example and teaching of mothers were thus to foster in the younger wives and mothers that love for husband and children which should bless the home life. Love is the highest blessing in an earthly home, and of this the wife and mother is the natural centre. The union and mutual love of husband and wife Scripture compares to that of Christ and the Church; and the gospel everywhere blesses and dignifies the family, exalting all the natural relations, and making the home life helpful to the life of holiness. (Eph. 5:22-33.)

5. To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home (*occupied in home duties*)—the virtues of the true wife, which shed sweetness and grace on the home. These the mothers are to cultivate in their daughters, and thus fit them to carry blessing to the homes over which they shall preside. The Christian mother thus multiplies and perpetuates her usefulness in the homes of her children. 'Keepers at home.' Most of the best manuscripts, as the Sinaitic, Alexandrian, Ephraem, have *workers at home* (οἰκουργούς), a reading adopted by Lachmann, Alford, Tischendorff, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers. **Obedient** (*being in subjection*) **to their own husbands.** Compare, as illustrating and emphasizing the sanctities of home life, and the subordination of the different members of the family to its head, Eph. 5:13, 14, 22–24; Col. 3:18; 1 Peter 3:1–6. **That the word of God be not blasphemed** (*evil spoken of*). The domestic virtues in the character of the younger wives would commend the gospel to their husbands and to the world, and men observing its power in giving grace and beauty to their lives would be won to it. (Matt. 5:16; 1 Peter 3:1, 2.)

6. Young men likewise exhort to be soberminded—or, *to be discreet.* They are to cultivate sober thoughtfulness, practical wisdom, self-restraint; a thorough self-government, in which all the faculties and appetites and passions are under the control of a sound judgment and an enlightened conscience.

7, 8. In all things shewing thyself a pattern of good works. As a minister, and as still in comparative youth, his own spirit and life would be influential with the younger men; and he was required to be, therefore, in his own person a fitting model for them; and this, not in some things, but in *all things.* The duty of the minister to be a pattern, a model, for the people is one of the plain teachings of Scripture. (1 Cor. 11:1; 2 Thess. 3:9; 1 Tim. 4:12; 1 Peter 5:3.) **In doctrine** (*thy teaching*) **shewing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech, that cannot be condemned.** His teaching was to be marked, first, in its spirit, as incorrupt, thoroughly

9 *Exhort* servants to be obedient unto their own masters, *and* to please *them* well in all things; not answering again;
10 Not purloining, but shewing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things.

9 having no evil thing to say of us. *Exhort* [1] servants to be in subjection to their own masters, *and* to be well-pleasing *o them* in all things; not gainsaying;
10 not purloining but shewing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in

1 Gr. *bondservants.*

sincere and earnest; second, in its manner, as serious, dignified, not rhetorical, sensational, flippant; and third, in its substance and form, as healthful in the pure, life-giving doctrines and duties inculcated, and in the simple, fitting words with which it is clothed; thus avoiding all that the serious hearer could condemn. 'Sincerity'—in all the older manuscripts this word is wanting; most critical editors omit it from the text. **That he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of you.** When the life of the preacher is an example of good works, and his teaching is in spirit sincere, in manner reverent, and in substance true, the opposer finds nothing to criticise, and is plainly without reason in his opposition, He is thus disarmed. It is the obvious duty of the minister, as respects his life and work, to avoid, with all possible care, any just cause for censure or criticism, that the gospel may not suffer through imperfection either in his life or in his sermons; and though he may not always thus silence opposition, since men are by nature opposed to God, he will nevertheless commend himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God (2 Cor. 4:2); and he who has the consciences of the people on his side is likely in the end to win their hearts. Even if he fail to win, he is, by such a ministry, "pure from the blood of all men." (Acts 20:26.)

III. **9, 10.** DUTIES OF CHRISTIAN SLAVES.

9. Exhort servants (*slaves*) **to be obedient unto their own masters.** The immense number of slaves in the Roman Empire in the apostolic age, and the spiritual freedom and equality which the gospel proclaimed to all in the church, made the frequent repetition of this injunction necessary. See note, 1 Tim. 6; 1, and compare Eph. 6:5; 1 Peter 2:18. The gospel gave spiritual freedom, but it did not teach communism. It left the civil relations of life as they existed (1 Cor. 7:20-24), but it spiritually exalted and ennobled them, making the slave the Lord's freeman, and exalting the service done the master into a holy service done for Christ. So far from inciting insubordination, it taught the slave to render all the more cheerful service to the master, since in so doing he was serving and honoring Christ. **And to please them well in all things; not answering again**—they should study to make their service acceptable to the masters, especially avoiding a contrary spirit, or the disposition to set up their own will against the will of the master. 'Not answering again,' *not gainsaying*, or, *contradicting*. It is obvious that 'all things' is here limited to things not contrary to God's law, according to the principle, "we ought to obey God rather than men." (Acts 5:29.)

10. Not purloining. Compare Acts 5:2, 3. Petty stealing or purloining has always been a vice of slavery; it is a natural temptation of men who serve without formal wages, and conceive their master's property as in some sense their own. **But shewing all good fidelity.** The Christian slave is to resist this temptation, and, instead of yielding to this common vice, is to present a marked contrast by showing all good fidelity. His trustworthiness and integrity are to stand unimpeachable. 'Fidelity' (*πίστιν*): the only instance (if it be one) of the word in this sense in the Pastoral Epistles. The parallel passages suggest, even here, the usual sense of *faith; showing all good faith*—that is, manifesting in their service all the effects of faith. The service rendered to their masters should be a service of faith, done "unto the Lord and not unto men," "in singleness of heart, fearing the Lord," remembering that they "serve the Lord Christ," and looking for their reward from him. (Col. 3:22-25; Eph. 6:5-8.) **That they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things.** The Christian slave is to honor the doctrine of God, the author of his salvation, by seeking to please his master, and showing perfect fidelity to his master's interests; thus manifesting in his character and life the excellence and power of the religion he professed. "God deigns to receive an 'ornament' from slaves, whose condition was so mean and low, that they were wont to be

11 For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men,

11 all things. For the grace of God [1] hath appeared,

1 Or, *hath appeared to all men, bringing salvation.*

scarcely accounted men: for he does not mean 'servants' such as we have at the present day, but slaves who were bought with money, and held as property, like oxen and horses. And if the life of these men is an ornament to the Christian name, much more let those who are in honor take care that they do not stain it by their baseness." (Calvin.)

Note: A Christian's duty and usefulness lie exactly in, not outside of, the station in which God has placed him. The aged, the young, the slave, each in his own place, by fidelity to the duties of his station, will most effectively set forth the power and excellence of the gospel. The slave may serve Christ as truly and honorably as the master: it is not the place, but fidelity to the duties of the place, which finds honor before God. The Christian, therefore, is not restlessly to seek change of station, but to give all diligence to fulfill the duties of the station he occupies. No sermon is so effective as a life true to its own place and its own work. Its appeal to the conscience and the heart, though it be silent, is irresistible; and however humble the sphere of such a life, before it mere intellectual skepticism shrinks away refuted and ashamed. For the religion which exalts and ennobles actual life must be the religion of God.

Note, also, the emphasis here placed on ethical and practical preaching. The pulpit is not to present mere abstract doctrine, and leave the people to draw their own inferences as to the duties of every-day life. On the contrary, it must give plain, practical instruction, adapted to all ages and classes of hearers, as to the spirit and conduct incumbent on them as disciples of Christ. The conscience of the people is to be educated, and thus the life lifted into a higher sphere of thought and action. Above all, the character and life thus inculcated in the pulpit, are to find a distinct exemplification in the preacher himself. He will thus silence opposition, and make his words irresistible in their power over the conscience and the heart. (Rom. 2 : 21; 1 Tim. 4 : 12, 16.) Paul enforced his preaching by personal example, saying to his hearers: "Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily and justly and unblamably we behaved ourselves among you." (1 Thess. 2 : 10.)

11-15. GROUND OF THE FOREGOING EXHORTATIONS TO HOLY LIVING: THE GRACE OF GOD HAS FOR ITS END THE SANCTIFICATION OF MEN.—1. God's grace in the gospel, which brings salvation to all men, was manifested as training us to this end—namely, (*a*) that we should renounce impiety and all worldly lusts; (*b*) that, having thus renounced sin, we should live soberly and justly and piously in the present world; and (*c*) that, as an incentive to such a life, we should ever be looking forward to the blessed hope, even the appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour, Christ Jesus. (11-13.) 2. Our sanctification was the purpose in Christ's death for us: he gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify for himself a people peculiarly his own, distinguished by zeal for good works. (14.) 3. These things—namely, the duties of the several classes in the church, set forth, ver. 1-10, and the motives thereto, ver. 11-14—Titus is enjoined to teach; and, in the case of the erring and wayward, he is to administer rebuke with all authority, suffering no one to despise him. (15.)

11. For—introducing the ground of the preceding exhortations; holiness is the end sought by the gospel, and Titus is, therefore, to urge it on these classes in the church. **The grace of God**—the free, unmerited favor of God to sinful men; grace, which was before hidden (Eph. 3 : 1-9), but is now revealed in the coming and work of Christ. **That bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men**—better, as Revised Version, *hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men*—that is, salvation adapted to and offered to all men; not necessarily effectual for all men, since its power actually to save in any individual case is plainly conditioned on personal faith. (John 3 : 16-18.) "That grace of God whereby alone it is possible for mankind to be saved." (Beveridge.) He emphasizes the universal offer of the gospel, as a reason for applying it to all the different classes of men before mentioned. Compare 1 Tim. 2 : 4; 4 : 10.

12 Teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world;
13 Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ:

12 bringing salvation to all men, instructing us, to the intent that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly and righteously and godly
13 in this present [1] world; looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory [2] of the great God and

1 Or, *age*.....2 Or, *of our great God and Saviour.*

12. Teaching us. The Greek word here, (παιδεύσα), as used in the New Testament, has no exact equivalent in the English. It is more than teaching; rather, *exercising, training.* Men are depraved, sinful; and the gospel, in its requirements of self-denial, resistance of temptation, holy self-discipline, is conceived as an educative, disciplinary power, and as, through its discipline, delivering us from sin and working in us holiness. (1 Cor. 11:22; Heb. 12:6.) **That**—introducing the purpose or end of the training or discipline of the gospel. **Denying ungodliness and worldly lusts**—the means through which sanctification, the end designed by the gospel, is secured. The denying of impiety and inordinate earthly desires, or the firm resistance of the tendencies to evil within us, is an essential condition of salvation. For salvation does not consist only in a *change of relation to God*, in justification, pardon, adoption, but also in a *change of character in us*, in regeneration, sanctification, and holy living. Jesus saves his people *from their sins;* and this salvation, though all of grace, is not passively received, as if the soul were a mere recipient, but is actively appropriated through strenuous, persistent conflict with evil within itself. Hence the Christian life is represented as one of perpetual conflict. (Luke 9:23; Rom. 6:12, 13; 8:13; Eph. 6:10-18; Col. 3:5.) 'Worldly lusts'—literally, *the worldly lusts*—that is, *all* worldly lusts, or inordinate desires, such as the world cherishes. (Eph. 2:1-3.) **We should live soberly, righteously, and godly**—in these three words the language, perhaps without intending to define strictly, points out the three chief lines of human duty: first, the duty we owe ourselves, in maintaining a well-balanced mind, a self-governed, self-regulated spirit and life; second, the duty we owe to our fellow men, in a life of truth and justice and equity toward them; and third, the duty we owe God, in a life of piety, supremely devoted to him. This is the moral goal of Christian living, the grand end the gospel seeks to reach in its teaching and discipline. "Three words express the whole of Christianity: to be strict toward oneself, just to one's neighbor, and pious toward God. If thou livest thus, dear Christian, thou livest right." (Starke.) (Deut. 10:12; Eccl. 12:13; Micah 6:8; Matt. 22:34-39.) **In this present world**—or, *present age*, as distinguished from the future life, and especially regarded as an evil, sinful age. "*In this world*—because the Lord has appointed life for the trial of our faith." (Calvin.)

13 Looking for that blessed hope—'hope,' not subjective, but objective, put for the thing hoped for, as Acts 24:15; Rom. 8:24, 25; Gal. 5:5. **And the glorious appearing** (*the appearing of the glory*). As an incentive to such a holy life. Christians have a blessed object of hope; they are awaiting, expecting, the manifestation of the glory; namely, that which shall be made at the second appearing of the Lord Jesus; which, as completing his redemption, is the highest and most glorious object of hope set before the Christian. In this life, he has only the beginnings of salvation; but he is expecting to share in the glory of God (Rom. 5:2), and his eye is fixed on Christ's second coming, as the epoch of "the adoption; to wit, the redemption of our body"; when his salvation, now only begun, will reach its glorious completion, in the redemption and glorification of his whole nature. (Rom. 8:18-26; 1 Cor. 1:7; Phil. 3:20, 21; 1 Thess. 1:9, 10; 2 Tim. 4:8; Heb. 9:28; 1 Peter 1:13.) "The living as Christians, soberly, righteously, and godly, is thus *grounded* in faith in the appearing of grace (ver. 11), and is *strengthened* by the hope of another appearing; namely, of glory." (Van Oosterzee.) **Of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.** Whether 'great God' is here a designation of Christ or of God the Father, is a question still in debate. I regard it as designating Christ for the following reasons: 1. The translation, "our Great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ," though not absolutely necessary, is in every way grammatically the more natural. 2. The following context, in the relative clause (ver. 14), "who gave himself for us," plainly relates

14 Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.

14 our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a people for his own possession, zealous of good works.

only to Christ, but naturally requires us to take the whole preceding expression, 'our Great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ,' as its antecedent. 3. The evident purpose is to emphasize the greatness of what he gave when he gave *himself;* it would, therefore, be entirely natural to present here the supreme divinity of his nature, as *our Great God.* 4. The designation of Christ as God accords with the analogy of other Scriptures (Isa. 9:6; John 20:28; Rom. 9:5; 1 Tim. 3:16; Heb. 1:8); while a passage very similar in sense and construction to this occurs in 2 Peter 1:11, "the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ." 5. The Fathers, both Greek and Latin, with rare exceptions, so understood it, as do by far the larger number of modern expositors, as Calvin, Tholuck, Olshausen, Wiesinger, Ebrard, Van Oosterzee, Hofmann, Fairbairn, Ellicott, and Wordsworth. Others, as De Wette, Huther, and Alford, dissent, but, though referring the words to God the Father, they, for the most part, insist that the passage is a strong testimony to the supreme divinity of Christ, because of the intimate association in it of Christ with the Father.

14. Who gave himself for us. Christ 'gave himself'; his offering was purely voluntary (John 10:11-18; 17:19); and it was nothing less than *himself*, his own divine human personality—"Himself, his whole self, the greatest gift ever given." (Gal. 1:4; Eph. 5:25.) 'For us'; the preposition does not necessarily signify *instead of*, but only, *in behalf of;* but in this context, where it is said, *he gave himself . . . to redeem*, and consequently, as the ransom price, it is impossible to exclude the idea of a substitution of himself for us. (Acts 20:28; 1 Tim. 2:6; 1 Peter 1:18, 19; 3:18.) **That he might redeem us from all iniquity.** 'Might redeem' (λυτρώσηται); might free us by means of a ransom paid. (Matt. 20:28; Mark 10:45; Eph. 1:7.) '*Iniquity* (ἀνομία), *lawlessness;* whatever in us is unconformed, or opposed, to the divine law. Thus, in Rom. 6:14, *sin* (ἁμαρτία), is, in like manner, conceived as a master, holding the soul in bondage, but from whose control Christ frees us. The apostle speaks here of a redemption, not from the condemnation, but from the power of sin, from sin as an active, controlling principle within us. The two cannot, however, be disjoined, except in thought; for sanctification, or deliverance from the sin-power, is everywhere represented as a result of justification, or deliverance from condemnation. See especially Romans, chapters 6 and 7. This redemption *from all iniquity*, lawlessness, has as its final result perfect conformity to law; "that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." (Rom. 8:4.) **And purify unto himself a peculiar people** (*a people for his own possession*), **zealous of good works**—or, *a people peculiarly his own.* 'Peculiar'—the Common Version is unfortunate here, as giving by this word the idea that Christians are to be *peculiar* in the sense of being unlike others, whereas the thought is, that they, in a special or peculiar sense, belong to Christ, and that the badge of his ownership in them is their zeal for good works. As Israel in the Old Testament are represented as God's chosen people, his peculiar treasure (Exod. 19:5, 6; Deut. 7:6; 14:2), so in the New Testament Christians are Christ's special people, given to him by the Father (John 6:37; 17:6-8), forming the body of which he is the head (Eph. 1:22, 23; Col. 1:18), and made to him "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a *peculiar* people," that is, a people specially his own. (1 Peter 2:9.) "Christ Jesus, our Great God and Saviour, redeemed us to himself, in order that he might make a Christian people peculiar to himself, who should then indeed be peculiarly his, if they proved to be zealous of good works." (Jerome.) "Here, also, as in Eph. 5:25-27, Paul brings forward the thought, that atonement for sin in itself, although the first, is by no means the last and the highest end of the sacrifice of Christ, but becomes the means, further, for the attainment of a higher, yea, the highest end, the sanctification of the pardoned sinner, and his renewal after the glorious image of God." (Van Oosterzee.) He came, not only to deliver us from all condemnation, but also, through this deliverance, to purify us from all sin; hence the evidence that we are Christ's own is

15 These things speak, and exhort, and rebuke with all authority. Let no man despise thee.

15 These things speak and exhort and reprove with all [1] authority. Let no man despise thee.

CHAPTER III.

PUT them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work.
2 To speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, *but* gentle, shewing all meekness unto all men.

1 Put them in mind to be in subjection to rulers, to authorities, to be obedient, to be ready unto every
2 good work, to speak evil of no man, not to be contentious, to be gentle, shewing all meekness toward

1 Gr. *commandment.*

that we bear his moral likeness and walk in his steps. 'Zealous of good works.' "Whoever is confident in him as our Saviour, who gave himself for us, should also be zealous of good works, since this was the purpose for which he gave himself for us; and whoever lives in the hope that he will reveal himself as our God in glory, he should show by his conduct in this present time that he is awaiting such a revelation of him, who for such a purpose gave himself for us." (Hofmann.)

15. These things speak, and exhort, and rebuke with all authority. 'These things'—the duties mentioned in verses 1-10. 'Speak, and exhort'—the general duty of Titus toward all his hearers. 'Rebuke'—a special duty toward the careless and disobedient. 'With all authority'—or, authoritativeness—that is, with all the authority belonging to his office, "with every sort of imperative earnestness, as of one having a right to enjoin." **Let no man despise thee**—do not suffer thy authority to be despised. Here the thought is, not as 1 Tim. 4 : 11, "Let no man despise thy youth"—that is, give no occasion to any one to despise thee, but rather, do not permit thy authority to be disregarded; insist firmly on obedience. The reason for this injunction to self-assertion probably lay in the Cretan character, which could be best influenced by authority. "Mere doctrine is not enough. Thou must exhort and rebuke with all earnestness, and not suffer thyself to be despised." (Hedinger.)

Ch. 3 : 1, 2. THE CONDUCT TO BE REQUIRED OF CHRISTIANS IN THEIR RELATIONS TO GOVERNMENT AND TO SOCIETY.—Titus is enjoined to remind them—1. To subject themselves to the civil authorities; and, 2. To exercise the virtues of good citizens and healthful members of society.

1. Put them in mind—as of a duty already known, but in danger of being forgotten. **To be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates.** The direction is designed to cover all the Christian's relations to the State, whether to the supreme government, to governors, or to others in subordinate authority; in all these relations, he is to maintain the attitude of subjection; except when obedience to human authority would be disobedience to God; and even then, while declining to obey, he is to submit to the penalty. (Acts 4 : 19, 20; 5 : 29.) Insubordination to civil authority, especially to the hated Roman dominion, was a common temptation of the Jews, as the frequent and bloody insurrections of that period show. It is said to have been especially common among the Cretans, who had formerly lived under democratic institutions, and who, since the subjection of the island to Rome, B. C. 67, had engaged in frequent and bloody rebellions. (Polybius II. 46.) This was also a false charge made against Christians, and was a not unfrequent pretext for their persecution. Hence the more urgently Christ and the apostles enjoin on them a quiet submission to the powers that be. (Matt. 22 : 21; Rom. 13 : 1-7; 1 Tim. 2 : 1, 2; 1 Peter 2 : 13-17.) **To be ready to every good work**—prompt and hearty in obedience to every righteous law, and in doing what befits loyal citizens and good men. To those so doing, rulers are not a "terror," rather, they are "for the praise of them that do well." (Phil. 4 : 8.)

2 To speak evil of no man. This does not refer to speaking evil of rulers only (Acts 23 : 5; 2 Peter 2 : 10; Jude 8), but forbids indulgence in slander or evil speaking of any one. It prohibits all uncharitable talk. (Prov. 17 : 9; Eph 4 : 29-32; Col. 3 : 8; James 1 : 26; 4 : 12; 1 Peter 2 : 1; 3 : 9; Jude 9.) **To be no brawlers**—*not to be contentious*—not quarrelsome, or disposed to dispute or wrangle. (1 Tim. 3 : 3.) **But gentle**—the word signifies to be moderate in one's passions, fair, equitable; then to be forbearing, clement. (Phil. 4 : 5; 1 Tim. 3 : 3; James 3 : 17.) **Showing all**

3 For we ourselves also were sometime foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, *and* hating one another.
4 But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared.

3 all men. For we also were aforetime foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, hating one
4 another. But when the kindness of God our

meekness (*gentleness*) **to all men.** (1 Cor. 4: 21; Gal. 6: 1.) The believer, in all the relations of life, is to be, in spirit and bearing, gentle, kind, considerate; and this, not to friends only, but to all classes of men.

3-7. Such Dispositions and Conduct Toward Others, Enforced and Illustrated by God's Kindness and Mercy to us.—1. We ourselves were once, like others, foolish and sinful, enslaved to pleasures and lusts, and filled with unholy dispositions; yet God's kindness and love to man was manifested in saving us. (3, 4.) 2. This salvation had its source, not in works wrought in righteousness by us, but solely in God's mercy; it was made effectual for us by means of the regeneration and renewal effected by the Holy Spirit; and it has for its end, to make us, through our justification by God's grace, heirs according to the hope of eternal life. (5-7.)

3. For we ourselves also—as a reason for this forbearance and gentleness toward others, he now cites their own former character and life in sin, and the forbearance and kindness of God to them; but using the first person, he includes in the statement himself and all Christians, while in the old, sinful life. See the similar contrast between the Christian's past and present state, especially Eph. 2: 2-13, but also, Rom. 6: 17; 11: 30; 1 Cor. 6: 11; Eph. 4: 17-24; 5: 8; Col. 1: 21; 3: 7, 8. **Were sometimes** (*once*) **foolish**—without spiritual understanding, or the true knowledge of spiritual things; "having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart." (Eph. 4: 18.) **Disobedient**—that is, to God, as the thought now turns to spiritual relations. This is the attitude of the natural heart toward God; "the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." (Rom. 8: 7.) **Deceived**—or, *led astray*, from God and rectitude. (2 Tim. 3: 13; Matt. 18: 12; 1 Tim. 3: 6; 1 Peter 2: 25.) **Serving** (as slaves) **divers lusts and pleasures.** The service to these was slavery. They were impelled, driven by their own lusts and pleasures, as the slave is driven by a master. (Rom. 6: 16; 16: 18; Eph. 2: 3; 2 Tim. 3: 6.) **Living in malice and envy**—as their habitual dispositions, the element in which their lives moved. They meditated and sought evil to others, and grudged and fretted at the good others possessed. (Eph. 4: 31; Col. 3: 8; 1 John 3: 12.) **Hateful and hating one another**—with characters and dispositions such as to awaken, and keep active, hatred one to the other. In social life, as man was related to man, instead of mutual sympathy, there was mutual repulsion, thus dissolving the very bonds of society. These fearful results of sin, as seen in heathenism, are more fully depicted in Rom. 1: 29-32.

4. But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared. 'Kindness' (χρηστότης)—goodness practically manifested, benevolence shown in act. (Rom. 2: 4; 11: 22; Eph. 2: 7.) 'Love toward man' (φιλανθρωπία)—love as specially exercised toward men; a quality ascribed to men (Acts 28: 2), and elsewhere in the New Testament only used here. The two words are here closely related, and are intended to place God, in his dispositions and conduct toward men, in contrast with sinful men, who live (ver. 3) in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another. The argument is: "The goodness and love of God to man, on which our salvation is based, should lead us to show benevolence and gentleness to all men." (Huther.) If God showed such kindness and love to men as he has manifested in saving us, we also ought to show kindness and love to all men: John 3: 16; 1 John 4: 7-12; compare Matt. 18: 32, 33. 'God our Saviour'—here, as elsewhere in these epistles, God the Father, as the Author or Source of our salvation: 2: 13; 1 Tim. 1: 1; compare 2 Cor. 5: 18; 1 John 4: 9. "The whole of the passage which now follows has a great similarity with ch. 2: 11-14, and yet has a character entirely its own. There the apostle, in order to stimulate to Christian devoutness, exhibited the holy aim of the redemption which men obtain through Christ; here, on the other hand, in contrast with the entire

5 Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost;

5 Saviour, and his love toward man, appeared, not by works *done* in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saved us, through the [1] washing of regeneration [2] and renew-

1 Or, *laver*.....2 Or, *and* through *renewing*.

unworthiness of unbelievers, he dwells upon the grace shown to them, in order to incite them to a gratitude which shall first of all manifest itself in love toward those who have not yet attained the priceless privileges of believers." (Van Oosterzee.)

5. Not by works of righteousness which we have done—that is, not *by virtue of, in consequence of*, our works. The pronoun 'we' is emphatic; he did not save us because of, or on the ground of, righteous works that *we* did. Righteous works performed by *us* were not the meritorious cause, nor the influencing motive of his saving us. 'Of (*in*) righteousness' —the sphere, or element, of the works denied. *Which we did*—not 'have done,' as the Common Version. The aorist form of the verb makes the denial of merit in us, as the ground of his saving us, universal; it was not our works, either already done, or foreseen as to be done by us, that moved him to save us. **But according to his mercy he saved us**—"after the measure of, in pursuance of, after the promptings of" his mercy. The real ground of his saving us was in himself, not in us. The mercy of God—his own, self-moved, spontaneous compassion, apart from all deserving in us—originated and wrought our salvation. "*He saved us;* not for foreseen works of ours, but of his own free grace and mercy alone. Works must be in the saved (where is room for them), but not among the causes of salvation; they are the way to the kingdom, not the meriting price of it; all is upon the footing of undeserved favor from first to last. Election is of grace; we are chosen to be holy, not because it was antecedently seen that we should be so. (Eph. 1 : 4.)" (Henry.) Compare 2 Thess. 2 : 13; 2 Tim. 1 : 9; Eph. 2 : 8. Observe, nothing is here said of faith as a condition of salvation, because the apostle is speaking of salvation wholly on its divine side, as originating, not in response to something existing in, or done by, man, but entirely within God himself, springing spontaneously from his mercy. (Rom. 3 : 20, 24; Eph. 2 : 8-10.) **Through the washing of regeneration.** The apostle now states the divine acts by which the salvation, thus originated, is made effectual to men; namely, the regeneration and sanctification of the soul; divine acts, which, like the salvation itself, are prompted, not by men's deservings, but by God's prevenient grace. 'Washing' (λουτρόν)—found in the New Testament only here and in Eph. 5 : 26; literally denotes a bath, either (1) the place or water in which a bath is taken, or (2) the act of bathing or washing, as Eccles. 31 : 30. See Lexicons of Cremer, Robinson, Thayer's Grimm's Wilke. It probably has allusion here to the immersion which took place in baptism, either to the laver, or place, in which that was performed, or to the act of baptism itself. "A reference to baptism, which might all the more easily be exhibited as a *laver* (λουτρόν), since it was originally performed by the entire submersion of the person baptized." (Van Oosterzee.) 'Regeneration' (παλιγγενεσία), which is used only here and in Matt. 19 : 28, signifies a *re-birth*. Here it is applied to the *re-birth* of the soul, as John 3 : 3, 5, "born again"; in the other passage, it relates to the re-birth of external nature which will take place at the Second Coming of Christ, when the earth itself, as well as redeemed man, shall be delivered from the weakness and pollution of sin, and shall be changed into the purity and splendor which befit his everlasting kingdom.

The question to be raised on this passage is: Does the apostle use the term 'washing' literally, to designate the outward rite of baptism, and thus affirm that this rite is the instrument of regeneration? Or is it used figuratively, the sign being put for the thing signified, the outward washing of water for the inward cleansing of the Holy Spirit? The latter interpretation, according to which the words present the divine act of the Spirit in regeneration, seems to me an absolute exegetical necessity. For 1. The apostle is speaking here, not of human acts, but exclusively of the divine impulsion and the divine acts in the matter of man's salvation. To interpolate into this series of divine acts, or to identify with any one act of this series a purely human act,

such as the outward rite of baptism, would be utterly inconsistent with the whole scope of the passage. The literal interpretation, therefore, would contravene a plain, exegetical law. 2. In the related passage (Eph. 5:25, 26), Paul, when speaking of Christ's love for the church, says, according to the Revised Version, he gave himself up for it, that he might sanctify it, *having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word* (καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ του ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι). Here the words "having cleansed it by the washing of water" are qualified by the appended clause, "with the word," clearly showing that baptism is referred to only as the outward symbol of an inward cleansing, effected by means of the divine word, as elsewhere it is said of Christians that they are "born again by the word of God." (1 Peter 1:23; James 1:18.) He thus carefully guards against the idea that the inward cleansing, or regeneration, is effected by the outward baptism. 3. It is evident, also, that all those passages which require regeneration prior to baptism forbid the interpretation here that baptism is the instrument or means of regeneration. The apostolic commission directs the ministry first to disciple, and then to baptize (Matt. 28:19); and this order is never reversed in the New Testament, but is constantly exemplified in the apostolic history. (Acts 2:41; 8:12.) Regeneration, therefore, precedes baptism, and cannot be an effect of it. 4. The conception of an outward rite, either as in itself effecting a spiritual change, or as efficiently conveying divine grace, is strongly condemned by Scripture. Paul, in his great argument against the Jewish ritualists (Rom. 2) closes with these words: "For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew who is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God"—a passage which denies, in the most positive manner, that a mere outward rite has power, either in itself or as a means, to impart spiritual character to the soul, or to change a man's relations to God. 5. The one condition of salvation in the New Testament is personal faith in Christ, a spiritual, not a ritual condition. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," is God's word. Christ does, indeed, say: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"; but he immediately adds—not, he that is not baptized shall be lost, but, "he that *believeth* not shall be damned." He thus clearly shows that salvation is necessarily connected, not with baptism, but with faith; a grace that presupposes regeneration. (John 3:14, 46; 6:35 11:25, 26; 1 John 5:1.) 6. The facts of experience, also, show that baptism has no power to regenerate; for many baptized persons, not only give no evidence of a regenerate character, but furnish the most palpable evidence to the contrary. Finally, baptismal regeneration, in whatever form held, has proved one of the most fatal errors in the history of Christianity. It is precisely the doctrine of ancient Phariseeism, which regarded circumcision as insuring salvation, even irrespective of the personal character; and its necessary effect, as all history has shown, is to destroy in men's souls a sense of the need of that great spiritual change which is wrought alone by the Holy Spirit, and of which the Lord spake when he said, YE MUST BE BORN AGAIN. Evidently, then, 'the washing of regeneration' is a figurative expression, the sign being put for the thing signified—a figure relating to this subject, of constant recurrence in the New Testament (Acts 22:16; Gal. 3:27; Eph. 5:26; Col. 2:12; 1 Peter 3:21); and the interpretation of it as affirming that the outward rite is the instrument, or means, of regeneration, is at variance with the scope of the passage, the analogy of Scripture, and the evident facts of human experience. It is evident, also, that this conclusion is equally certain if, with some interpreters, we translate the adjoined clause "*even* the renewing of the Holy Ghost," making it exegetical of the first clause; for in that case, *the washing of regeneration* is necessarily a figurative, and not a literal expression. **And the renewing of the Holy Ghost.** *Renewing* (ἀνακάινωσις)—if we regard the analogy of Rom. 12:2, as also of those passages in which the verb is used, 2 Cor. 4:16; Eph. 4:23; Col. 3:10—refers to the work of sanctification, or the continuous renewal by the Spirit of that spiritual life in the soul which was begun in regeneration. 'Renewing' is simply the development and extension of regeneration, a continuous work of the Spirit within the soul, through which the new spiritual life advances toward complete supremacy and possession, permeating, purifying, and ennobling all the

6 Which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour;
7 That being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.

6 ing of the Holy Spirit, which he poured out upon
7 us richly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that, being justified by his grace, we might be made

faculties of the man, until he is transformed into the full image of Christ. (2 Cor. 3 : 18; Eph. 4 : 13.) These divine acts, *regeneration* and *renewing*, by which salvation is made effectual to our souls, are manifestations of the kindness and love of our Saviour God to us, which, the apostle argues, should lead us to show kindness and love to others.

6. Which he shed on us abundantly (*poured forth on us richly*)—thus fulfilling the promises of the Old Covenant respecting the pouring out of his Spirit. (Joel 2 : 28-32; John 7 : 37-39.) *Spirit* (πνεῦμα)—literally, signifies *breath*, *wind*, or air in motion. In accordance with this conception, the Holy Spirit is represented in a figurative usage, as *poured out* upon us, as of a liquid transfusing or flowing over us. (Acts 2 : 17, 18, 33.) In like manner we are said to be *baptized* or immersed in the Spirit, as the body is enveloped, pervaded by the air; as also, Christians are commanded to live, to walk, to pray "in the Spirit," as the element in which the moral life exists and acts. In all these, the richness and fullness of the Spirit's presence, and the power and completeness of his influence find expression. **Through Jesus Christ our Saviour**—as the medium through which the Spirit's presence is secured to us. The coming of the Heavenly Comforter, in the fullness of his power, is the direct result of the sacrifice and intercession of Christ. Jesus said: "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth." (John 14 : 16, 26; 15 : 26; 16 : 7; Acts 2 : 33; 2 Cor. 1 : 21, 22.) Observe the presence and agency of the whole Trinity in the work of our salvation. It has its source in "the kindness and love-to-man of the Father," "who shed on us the Holy Ghost abundantly"; it comes "through Jesus Christ our Saviour," who "died for us," and "ever liveth to make intercession for us"; and it is made effectual in the soul "by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost."

7. That—expressing the design of God in saving us through the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit was given for conviction of sin and the inward revelation of Christ (John 16 : 8, 14), thus leading to faith and consequent justification. **Being justified by his grace.** Justification, with Paul, is not negative merely, the non-imputation of sin, freedom from guilt; but therein the soul is divinely declared righteous, as clothed with all the righteousness of Christ; and it is precisely in this new and exalted relation, as a justified soul, is developed a new and holy character and life. Justification, therefore, can never be disjoined from sanctification, as the apostle shows in Rom. 6. It originates in the free, unmerited favor of God, and even the faith which appropriates it is "the gift of God." (Rom. 3 : 24; 5 : 15; 11 : 5, 6; Eph. 2 : 8-10.) **We should be made heirs.** Justification, with its holy fruits, is essential to a consciousness of the adoption, which makes us children, and consequently "heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ." (Rom. 8 : 14-17.) It was promised to Abraham that he "should be the heir of the world" (Rom. 4 : 13), because from him Christ should arise, who was appointed "heir of all things" (Heb. 1 : 2), and through whom the glorious inheritance of eternal life shall be given to all believers (Gal. 3 : 26-29; 4 : 4-7); an inheritance of which the Christian has already "the earnest," in the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (Eph. 1 : 14), and which, in its glory and perpetuity, is depicted as "an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away." (1 Peter 1 : 4.) **According to the hope of eternal life**—that is, "in pursuance of," "agreeably to," the hope of eternal life. The grand inheritance in prospect for believers is eternal life, which, though now possessed in its beginnings, is set before them as an object of hope, the goal of their earthly course (Rom. 8 : 18-24), and of which, in the inconceivable wealth of its meaning, they have been constituted heirs. (1 : 2; Mark 10 : 30; John 3 : 16; 4 : 14; 10 : 28; Acts 13 : 46; Rom. 6 : 22; 1 Tim. 6 : 12.) "We thank this grace that, instead of being delivered by our guilt to eternal death, we have come into such relation to God as to be heirs of eternal life. For we should not have received the Holy Spirit, restoring us anew to a holy life,—with the reception of whom we entered into heirship of eternal life,—had it not been for the grace of Christ, by

8 *This is* a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men.
9 But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain.

8 [1]heirs according to the hope of eternal life. Faithful is the saying, and concerning these things I will that thou affirm confidently, to the end that they who have believed God may be careful to [1]maintain good works. These things are good and profitable
9 unto men: but shun foolish questionings, and genealogies, and strifes, and fightings about the law;

1 Or, *heirs according to hope of eternal life*.....2 Or, *profess honest occupations.*

which we obtained that righteousness before God, which made us worthy of eternal life and of the Holy Spirit. . . . Without merit in us, God has redeemed us from the bondage of our former life in sin, and has given us the Holy Spirit, through whom we now stand in a new life; and if by virtue of that we are now heirs of eternal life, we owe this to the grace of Christ, through which we were made righteous before God." (Hofmann.)

Of this remarkable passage in ver. 3–7, Farrar has well said: "If any one were asked to fix on two passages which contained the essence of all Pauline theology, he would surely select Rom. 3 : 21–26 and Titus 3 : 5–7; and the latter, though less polemical, is in some respects the more complete."

8–11. This Doctrine of a Gratuitous Salvation to be Strongly Insisted on as an Incitement to Good Works.—1. The apostle wills that Titus strongly affirm this doctrine, in order that believers may be careful to maintain good works; but foolish controversies and genealogies and strifes about the law he is to avoid, as useless and hurtful. (8, 9.) 2. A schismatic, after a first and second admonition, he is to shun; since, by refusing to yield to admonition, such an one is shown to be perverted, and to be sinning although self-condemned. (10, 11.)

8. This is a faithful saying—that is, the statement in ver. 4–7, as to God's gratuitous bestowal of salvation. 'Faithful': worthy of confidence, assuredly true. (1 Tim. 1 : 15; 3 : 1; 4 : 9; 2 Tim. 2 : 11.) **And** (*concerning*) **these things I will that thou affirm constantly** (*confidently*)—or, possibly *constantly insist*, "make them the constant subjects of thy preaching." Compare 1 Tim. 1 : 7. *These things:* those which relate to the grace of God, just presented in ver. 5–7, which form the two motives to holy living. **That they which have believed in God**—a designation of the Cretan Christians, as distinguished from the heathen Cretans who believed false gods. Thus Luther: "those who have become believers in God." It of course involves the thought, though not directly expressing it, that they had believed God by receiving his gospel and publicly professing their faith in Christ. **May be careful to maintain good works**—or, as others, *be foremost*, or *excel in good works.* All true inspiration to a life of holy obedience comes from a sense of God's grace in saving us. "We love him [God] because he *first* loved us." (1 John 4 : 19.) "The love of Christ constraineth us." (2 Cor. 5 : 14.) The doctrines which unfold before men that marvelous self-moved grace, therefore, are to be strongly and constantly insisted on, to incite to a life of holiness. 'Be careful,' (*φροντίζωσιν*): "reflect on something, take an interest in something; here, as often in the classics, with a suggestion of anxiety." (Huther.) The word, though used in the Septuagint, is not elsewhere found in the New Testament. 'Good works': not merely benevolence, but an honorable and holy life. **These things**—the doctrines which reveal God's infinite love to us in Christ, and in which thus lie the motives to a true obedience to him. **Are good and profitable unto men**—good in themselves, as great spiritual verities, and useful to men, as influencing to beneficent and holy living.

9. But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law. 'Avoid,' *stand aloof from;* he is to have nothing to do with them. The apostle thus describes the subjects, methods and spirit of the discourses of the heretical teachers; which consisted in foolish questions, not worthy and often not possible to be answered, mystical interpretations of names in genealogical lists, and controversies in regard to minute and frivolous points in the Jewish law—matters of no practical moment, but tending to incessant strife. Repeated warnings against these frivolous and hurtful subjects of discourse are given in the Pastoral Epistles—

10 A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject;
11 Knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself.
12 When I shall send Artemas unto thee, or Tychicus,

10 for they are unprofitable and vain. A factious man
11 after a first and second admonition [1] refuse; knowing that such a one is perverted, and sinneth, being self-condemned.
12 When I shall send Artemas unto thee, or Tychi-

1 Or, *avoid.*

a fact that indicates probably one of the dangerous tendencies of that age, as, indeed, we might infer from the frivolous and superstitious character of it. See 1 : 10–14; 1 Tim. 1 : 4–7, and notes there; 6 : 4–7; 2 Tim. 2 : 23. The vapid, senseless questions often discussed in the Rabbinic writings perhaps give us the clearest conception of the utterly inane and worthless discourse here reprobated. **For they are unprofitable and vain**—useless and morally fruitless. They had no power to purify and elevate and ennoble the heart and life.

10. A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject. 'A heretic': one who is not only false in doctrine, but factious in spirit and conduct; a fomentor of strife and divisions, a maker of schisms. The noun (*αἵρεσις*), from which heretic is derived, is used in the New Testament, as designating not so much a doctrinal error, *heresy*, as a faction, division, schism, sect, although more or less of error is supposed, as the basis of the division (Acts 5 : 17; 15 : 5; 24 : 5, 14; 26 : 5; 28 : 22; 1 Cor. 11 : 9; Gal. 5 : 20); and in some cases an organized form of error is the main thought. (Acts 24 : 14; 2 Peter 2 : 1.) The exhortation here is similar to that in Rom 16 : 17. "Mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have received, and avoid them." Such a person he is first to admonish, and, if necessary, to repeat the admonition: a procedure which, in accordance with Matt. 18 : 15–17, perhaps indicates the ordinary method in cases of discipline, and at least shows that the offender is to be carefully and patiently convinced of his fault, and, if possible, to be reclaimed from it. If these admonitions fail, Titus is not to contend with the schismatic, but to reject him. 'Reject'—literally, *excuse thyself from, shun.* Compare Luke 14 : 18, 19; 1 Tim. 4 : 7; 2 John 10 : 11. The word does not directly enjoin the exclusion of the offender from the church, but rather, that he be avoided, that his society be shunned: but, connected here as it is with the usual disciplinary admonitions, it certainly suggests this as, at least, the ultimate result. Self-opinionative and vain, he has refused to be won by kindness and argument; and now, instead of gratifying his self-importance by the notoriety of a public controversy, Titus is to shame him by leaving him unnoticed. Factious men and foolish errors are sometimes pushed into prominence by being controverted; whereas, if they were shunned, thoroughly let alone, they would of themselves come to nought. A very different rule of action is given in cases where the error is, not as in this case, *foolish* but vital, affecting fundamental truth, or where the offense constitutes a plain breach of morality. (1 Cor. 5 : 1-13; 1 Tim. 1 : 19, 20.)

11. Knowing—or, *since thou knowest*, by the failure of thy admonitions. **That he that is such is subverted**—turned out of the true way. (1 Tim. 1 : 6; 5 : 15; 2 Tim. 4 : 4.) The ill success of the admonitions showed that his error was not one of the head, which argument might correct, but one of the heart, which argument might only intensify. **And sinneth, being condemned of himself** (*self-condemned*). The meaning here is not clearly settled; but probably it is either: 1. He habitually lives in sin, in spite of the condemnation of his own conscience. The conscience has become so perverted, that, though knowing himself to be wrong, he still persists in a false way. (Rom. 1 : 32; 1 Tim. 4 : 2.) "The aggravating circumstance is not that the man condemns himself *directly and explicitly*, as this might be a step to recovery, but that he condemns himself *indirectly and implicitly*, as acting against the law of his mind, and doing in his own particular case what in the general he condemns." (Ellicott.) Or, 2. He habitually lives, not only in error, but in sin, and his own evil character and life, therefore, condemn him.

12-15. CLOSING DIRECTIONS AND SALUTATIONS.

12. When I shall send Artemas unto thee, or Tychicus. Artemas is not elsewhere mentioned, and nothing is certainly known of

be diligent to come unto me to Nicopolis: for I have determined there to winter.
13 Bring Zenas the lawyer and Apollos on their journey diligently, that nothing be wanting unto them.
14 And let ours also learn to maintain good works for necessary uses, that they be not unfruitful.

cus, give diligence to come unto me to Nicopolis:
13 for there I have determined to winter. Set forward Zenas the lawyer and Apollos on their journey diligently, that nothing be wanting unto them.
14 And let our *people* also learn to [1]maintain good works for necessary [2]uses, that they be not unfruitful.

1 Or, *profess honest occupations*.....2 Or, *wants*.

him; Tychicus, a native of Asia, accompanied Paul from Greece to Asia, on the third mission (Acts 20:4); bore the epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon to Asia, in company with Onesimus, during Paul's first imprisonment at Rome (Eph. 6:21; Col. 4:7-9), in which epistles he is described as "a beloved brother and faithful in the Lord"; and again, during Paul's second Roman imprisonment, he is sent by him to Ephesus, apparently to take the place of Timothy there. (2 Tim. 4:12.) **Give diligence** (hasten) **to come unto me to Nicopolis.** Three cities of this name existed within the sphere of Paul's work, one in Cilicia, another in Thrace, and a third in Epirus. The last, a city built by Augustus in commemoration of his victory at Actium, and hence called *city of victory*, is commonly supposed to be the one here referred to. **For I have determined there to winter.** He does not say *here*, but *there*. It is plain, therefore, that he had not yet reached Nicopolis, and that this Epistle was not written from that city, as the subscription falsely states. Artemas and Tychicus were evidently, like Timothy and Titus, evangelists assisting Paul in his widely extended missionary work; and it was the apostle's intention to send one of them to take Titus' place in Crete, so as to permit him to come to Paul at Nicopolis, where he would pass the winter. Titus' work in Crete, therefore, was purely temporary, and the statement of the subscription, that he was "first bishop of the Cretians," has no basis, either in the New Testament or in authentic history. It is wholly inconsistent with all the known facts.

13. Bring Zenas, the lawyer, and Apollos on their journey diligently. The name Zenas, is a contraction of Zenodoras. Whether he was a Roman or a Jewish lawyer cannot be determined, as he is not elsewhere mentioned; possibly he was a Jew, who, after embracing Christ, was still called after his former occupation, as scribe or lawyer. (Matt. 22:35.) An apocryphal book, entitled "The Life and Acts of Titus," is ascribed to him. Apollos was a Jew of Alexandria, a disciple of John the Baptist, eloquent and mighty in the Scriptures; whom Aquila and Priscilla taught "the way of the Lord more perfectly" at Ephesus, and who subsequently preached with great power at Corinth and throughout Achaia. (Acts 18:24-28.) He labored much with Paul (1 Cor. 16:12); but, though differing in gifts from the apostle, he did not, as some affirm, differ from him in spirit or in doctrine (1 Cor. 3:3-10), as is evident here from Paul's injunction respecting him. Probably Zenas and Apollos were soon to enter upon a missionary journey, in the course of which they expected to visit Crete. **That nothing be wanting unto them**—that is, for the speeding and comfort of their journey. He is to hasten forward their journey, by seeing that their needs for it were supplied. (3 John 6; Acts 15:3; Rom. 15:24; 1 Cor. 16:6, 11.)

14. And (*but*) though enjoining this on thee, the burden should not fall on thee alone. **Let ours also** (of the Cretan churches) **learn to maintain good works for necessary uses**—that is, for the needs of Zenas, Apollos, and others, thus laboring in missionary work. The brethren of the Cretan churches should supply the necessities of these missionaries on their journey; a direction which shows that not only were the elders to be supported by the churches (1 Tim. 5:12, 13), but also the itinerant ministry, such as these evangelists assisting Paul in missionary labors. It was made a part of Titus' duty, to cultivate in them this missionary spirit, and train them in giving for the spread of the gospel. Missionary journeys, such as Zenas and Apollos were performing, involved expense, and this was to be borne by the churches. (Acts 15:3; 2 Cor. 11:8; Phil. 4:16; 3 John 5-8.) **That they be not unfruitful.** This they should do, not only to supply the expenses and needs of the missionaries, but still more, for their own spiritual life, as developing in them the grace of holy benevolence. This is a chief end in giving, as presented in Scripture. Covetousness, as a concentrated

15 All that are with me salute thee. Greet them that love us in the faith. Grace *be* with you all. Amen.

15 All that are with me salute thee. Salute them that love us in faith.
Grace be with you all.

form of selfishness, is a sin so insidious and deadly, that, whenever it becomes a governing characteristic, it excludes the soul from the kingdom of God. (Luke 12:15; Rom. 1:29; 1 Cor. 5:11; 6:10; Col. 3:5) One of the highest duties, therefore, of the ministry is to cultivate in men an unselfish benevolence. (2 Cor. 8:1-9; 9:6-15; Phil. 4:15-19.)

15. All that are with me salute thee—referring probably to Paul's fellow laborers, who were at present with him, and who, as well known to Titus, are not mentioned by name. **Greet them that love us in the faith.** 'In the faith'—the sphere, or element, of their love. They loved him as a Christian. The bond of their affection, the element in which it lived, was their common faith. "Love is represented as having its root in faith, this again as the bond of fellowship." (Wiesinger.) Christian faith is the enduring basis of true friendship; for souls united in that are united in common to Christ himself, and are thus in eternal union, bound ever more closely in the bonds of an everlasting friendship. **Grace be with you all**—a comprehensive benediction, invoking God's free, rich favor on Titus and on all associated with him. **Amen**—not found in the Sinaitic, Alexandrian, Ephraem, and other old manuscripts, and omitted by the best editors. The subscription is here, as in other epistles, spurious; and in this place it is at variance with the plain facts of the Epistle, as shown in the notes on verse 12.

INTRODUCTION TO THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON

THE GENUINENESS.

The private character and the brevity of this Epistle would naturally make it slow in coming to the notice of the churches; yet there are indications in the Epistles of Ignatius that, even as early as the period of the Apostolical Fathers, it had become known among the Pauline Epistles. It is acknowledged as such in the Muratorian Canon, in the last half of the second century. Tertullian and Origen, near the beginning of the third century, and Eusebius and Jerome, in the fourth, all either name it among the epistles of Paul, or quote from it as such. Its genuineness seems to have been commonly admitted in antiquity; but, in the fourth century, some objected to giving it a place in the Canon, because of its purely personal character, its brevity, and especially its lack of doctrinal significance, objections, which Jerome, Chrysostom, and Theodore of Mopsuestia notice and refute. The internal evidence is all in its favor; throughout, it breathes the spirit and bears the mark of Paul. The remarkable and evidently undesigned coincidences in it with the Epistle to the Colossians have been pointed out by Paley, and utterly exclude the supposition of forgery. ("Horæ Paulinæ," Chapter XIV.) German criticism has, however, assailed this, as it has the other epistles of the first Roman imprisonment. Baur, with the Tübingen school in general, places it among the doubtful epistles. But the grounds on which they base this doubt of its Pauline authorship,—such as the occurrence in it of some unusual words, etc.,—if used in testing literature in general, would set aside as spurious a large number of the best authenticated works of our own and of former times. So clearly does the letter exhibit the personal characteristics of the apostle, and so marked are the minute and undesigned coincidences with Paul's acknowledged writings, and with the facts of his life, that the internal evidence leaves absolutely no room for doubt, on any grounds which either sound criticism or ordinary common sense would justify. It would be far more difficult to account for the manifest presence of Paul's heart and head and hand in a forged epistle, than to account for a few new words, which common sense at once explains as natural and necessary in an epistle dealing with a subject unusual in its character and scope.

THE PERSON ADDRESSED AND THE OCCASION.

Philemon was a resident at Colosse in Phrygia; for Onesimus, his slave, belonged there, and Archippus, who is here addressed with Philemon, is alluded to as a minister there. (Ver. 2; Col. 4 : 9, 17.) Whether he filled an office in the Colossian Church is uncertain, as Paul speaks of him only as a "fellow-worker," which need not imply official station; but he was distinguished for his high religious character and his generous hospitality to the saints. Probably he was a man of substance, as his house was one of the meeting places of the church in Colosse, a fact which suggests that it was spacious, such

as only the wealthier classes occupied. (2.) His conversion doubtless occurred under the ministry of Paul, since the apostle, in making his appeal for the slave, says to Philemon, "Thou owest unto me even thine own self besides." (19.) If, as is generally supposed, Paul had not as yet personally visited Colosse, it is a natural supposition, that Philemon had come to Ephesus, the metropolis of Western Asia Minor, and had there been converted by the instrumentality of the apostle. (Acts 19 : 10, 26.) The resulting friendship was warm and enduring, leading to constant mutual remembrance in prayer. (4.) In regard to the others to whom the Epistle is addressed, it is supposed that Apphia was the wife of Philemon, and that Archippus, spoken of elsewhere as a minister, was his son, and the association of their names with his, in addressing the household, certainly renders the conjecture not improbable.

Onesimus, the immediate occasion of the Epistle, was a slave of Philemon. He had, apparently, in some way, wronged his master, and had fled to Rome, where, in the slums of the thronged metropolis of the world, he doubtless hoped to elude pursuit. In some way now unknown, he came in contact with the apostle, then a prisoner in Rome, and was converted. (Acts 28 : 30, 31.) A warm mutual attachment resulted, and to the imprisoned apostle the fugitive slave became, not only very dear, but probably in many ways useful. Paul would gladly have retained him ; but, though he does not doubt that Philemon, if he knew the circumstances, would grant him the service of Onesimus, he is unwilling to presume on this favor by anticipating it. Probably, also, Onesimus himself, now fully conscious of his wrong, desired to return, and make confession and reparation. But at that period, such a course might involve serious hazard to the slave ; torture, or even death, might be the result at the hands of a cruel and irritated master. In sending Onesimus, therefore, Paul not only commended him to the whole Colossian Church, as "the faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you" (Col. 4 : 9), but also wrote to Philemon this marvelously forceful and touching appeal in behalf of the now penitent and returning servant. The courtesy, delicacy, and tact of the Epistle have been admired in all ages, and render it in its pathos and beauty unapproached in epistolary literature. Among the numerous private epistles which have come down to us from antiquity, while there are many that exhibit great wealth of thought and polish of style, with much of sparkling wit, all fall far below this in nobility and elevation of sentiment, and breadth and tenderness of sympathy for man as man. In that age of slavery, when more than half the Roman world were in bondage, bought and sold as chattels and without rights in law, the apostle, looking beyond artificial, earthly distinctions, sees all redeemed men, whatever their social position, as one in Christ Jesus, equal before God, bound each to the other in the bonds of sacred, eternal brotherhood. From this high standpoint, which was unknown to ancient heathenism, but forms the distinctive social characteristic of Christianity, he pleads with the master for a once erring, but now penitent offender, belonging to the despised downtrodden class. The Epistle of Pliny the Younger, written to a friend, near the close of the first century, in behalf of an offending freedman, is one of the noblest utterances of heathen literature, and has often been compared with this ; but beautiful as it is, and, in the original, faultless in style, the whole conception of the illustrious heathen is far inferior to that of the apostle. The following is a translation :

"Caius Pliny to Sabinianus, health : Thy freedman, with whom thou saidst thou wast incensed, came to me, and falling at my feet, as if at thine, clung to them. He wept much, much he entreated, and much was the force of his silence. In short, he fully satisfied me of his penitence. Truly I believe him to be reformed, because he is sensible

of his wrong. Thou art angry, I know; and thou art angry justly, this also I know; but clemency has then the highest praise, when there is the greatest cause for anger. Thou hast loved the man; and I hope, thou wilt love him. Meanwhile it is sufficient that thou suffer thyself to be entreated. It will be right for thee to be angry with him again, if he shall deserve it, because having once yielded to entreaty, thine anger will be the more just.

"Forgive something in view of his youth. Forgive on account of his tears. Forgive for the sake of thy own kindness. Do not torture him, lest thou torture also thyself; for thou wilt be in torture, when thou, who art so gentle, shalt be angry. I fear lest, if to his prayers I should unite my own, I should seem not to ask, but to compel. Yet I will unite them, and the more fully and abundantly in that I have very sharply and severely reproved him, strictly threatening that I will never hereafter intercede for him. This I said to him, because it was necessary to alarm him; but I do not say the same to thee. For perchance I shall intercede again, and shall again obtain; only that my request be such as it befits me to ask and thee to grant. Farewell."

SLAVERY IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

At this period, more than half the population of the Roman Empire were slaves. Servile insurrections of great magnitude had occurred, which threatened to upheave and destroy the foundations of society and government. The Romans lived in constant fear of these outbreaks; and the most stringent and cruel laws chained down this vast body of bondmen. The slave had no rights in law. Absolutely under the master's control he could be tortured, maimed, crucified, or thrown to the wild beasts at his cruel caprice. The servile population formed an ever restless, seething, muttering volcano beneath the fabric of society, which might burst forth with terrible devastation at any moment. Roman law decreed, that if a master had been slain by a slave, the whole body of slaves in his household should be put to death. Only three years before Paul wrote this letter, a citizen having been thus assassinated, four hundred slaves composing his household, men, women, and children, though well known to be innocent of the crime, were relentlessly led to death. Such terrible examples were thought necessary to repress this servile element, and protect the masters.

What was the attitude of the gospel toward this gigantic evil? Plainly, it did not proclaim a crusade against slavery as a civil institution; this would only have been, in these circumstances, to excite these oppressed masses to bloody and anarchical revolution. Nothing is more evident than the presence of slaves in Christian families in the apostolic age, and the requirement of Scripture, enjoining obedience to the master. Christianity did not strike at once and directly at the civil relation. But it lifted both master and slave into a new relation to Christ, making them equal before God, equal in the church, and equal as citizens and heirs of the heavenly kingdom; and this great fact, as its significance came to be felt, changed the actual relation of master and slave, even where the formal, outward civil relation remained. Hence Philemon is not commanded to manumit Onesimus, but to receive him, no longer merely "as a servant; but above a servant, a brother beloved." It is easy to see that, as the gospel interpenetrated the social life, and created a Christian civilization, this change in the moral and spiritual relation of the parties would lead to a change in the civil relation, and master and slave, from the first unknown in the Church, would also cease to be known in the State. The chief significance of this Epistle for all the ages is, that *in Christ Jesus there is neither bond nor free;* that

Christianity means the moral and spiritual equality of all men before God and his church; and that consequently, as it enters and purifies and uplifts the race, there must come, through this Christian civilization, as the ultimate result, the equality of all men before the civil law. The Epistle thus touches the profoundest social questions of all ages and all lands.

THE TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

The Epistle was written during the apostle's first imprisonment at Rome, A. D. 60–63: and, as he expresses an expectation of speedy liberation, its date may probably be placed near the close of this period, A. D. 62 or 63. Tychicus, when departing for Asia, bearing the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, was accompanied by Onesimus; and the apostle sends this letter to insure the repentant fugitive a kind reception and full pardon. The Epistle is, therefore, to be studied in connection with the group of epistles belonging to the first Roman imprisonment.

LITERATURE OF THE EPISTLE.

The helps on this brief Epistle are very abundant and full; only the more recent and important will be here named. Among the best expositions are Wiesinger's, in Olshausen's "Commentaries;" Meyer's, in his "New Testament Commentary," and Van Oosterzee's in Lange's "Commentary"; all of which are now by translation accessible to the English reader. Van Oosterzee's, in Lange, is edited by the late Dr. Hackett, who has made additions of great value. Among modern English commentators may be specially named, Alford, Ellicott, and Lightfoot. The last named, in his "Commentary on Colossians and Philemon," has added much to the literature of the subject, and produced a work very rich in learning and exegetical value. Farrar's "Life and Work of St. Paul" should also be mentioned, it being quite full and valuable in its notice and analysis of this Epistle.

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

PAUL, a prisoner of Jesus Christ, and Timothy *our* brother, unto Philemon our dearly beloved, and fellow labourer,

2 And to *our* beloved Apphia, and Archippus our fellow soldier, and to the church in thy house:

1 Paul, a prisoner of Christ Jesus, and Timothy [1]our brother, to Philemon our beloved and fellow-
2 worker, and to Apphia [2]our sister, and to Archippus our fellow-soldier, and to the church in thy house:

1 Gr. *the brother*.....2 Gr. *the sister*.

1-3. ADDRESS AND GREETING.

1. Paul, a prisoner of Jesus Christ—not barely a prisoner for the sake of Christ, in bonds on account of his cause, but *Christ Jesus' prisoner.* In other epistles he appears as Christ's *servant:* here he is Christ's prisoner, as appointed by Christ to serve in that relation. "Whom Christ has placed in bonds." (Meyer.) (Eph. 3:1; 4:1; 2 Tim. 1:8.) He does not speak of himself as an apostle, because it is a private letter, and he does not here wish to command, but rather to entreat. 'A prisoner': "How could Philemon resist an appeal which was penned within prison walls, and by a manacled hand!" (Lightfoot.) **And Timothy our** (*the*) **brother.** Paul usually associates his assistants with him in his epistles; and in this instance, perhaps, it is to add to the force of the appeal, as Timothy was with Paul during the three years at Ephesus, and must have been well known by Philemon. *The brother:* the well-known brother. **Unto Philemon our dearly beloved, and fellow labourer**—not elsewhere mentioned, but, from his association here with Archippus, it is probable that he was a member of the church at Colosse, and one with whom Paul had labored either there or at Ephesus. It is not certain that he was a minister, although the title 'fellow laborer' is often applied to ministers (2 Cor. 8:23; Phil. 2:25; Col. 4:11), but it is certainly not restricted to them. (Rom. 16:3.) The relation between Paul and him was evidently one of tender affection; and, indeed, his character was such that the apostle styles him the 'beloved,' expressive probably of the general sentiment toward him.

2. And to our beloved Apphia—better, as the Revised Version, *to Apphia our* (the) *sister*—possibly the wife of Philemon; she is not elsewhere mentioned. The name occurs often in this form in Phrygian inscriptions; a fact which serves to confirm the genuineness of the epistle. As the return of the slave was a matter that concerned the whole household, it was natural that the mistress should be addressed as well as the master: her influence, also, might be important in leading Philemon to a right decision. 'Our beloved': the oldest manuscripts, as the Sinaitic, Alexdrian, Claromontanus, read *the sister*, a reading in itself more probable, and adopted by most editors. **And Archippus our fellow soldier**—probably a pastor of the church in Laodicea, a short distance from Colosse, as he is mentioned in immediate connection with that church in Col. 4:17. This, however, is not certain: the mention of him here, in connection with Philemon's household, seems to suggest Colosse as his residence, and certainly makes it possible that "the ministry he had received in the Lord" was fulfilled in Colosse He is supposed to have been Philemon's son. 'Fellow soldier': as, like Paul, engaged in conflict for the gospel (Phil. 2:25; 2 Tim. 2:3), and possibly as having labored with Paul and Timothy during the three years residence in Ephesus, A. D. 55–57. **And to the church in thy house**—"the section of the Christians at Colosse which met in his house." (Meyer.) Of church edifices as such we have few, or perhaps no authentic records before the close of the second century. Before that time, Christians met apparently in private houses or such public rooms as might be made available for purposes of worship. (Acts 18:6; 19:8-10; 28:30.) Probably in the houses of the wealthier church members there were rooms large enough for such gatherings. Thus we read in Col. 4:15, of "Nymphas and the church which is in his house," and also of Aquila and Priscilla, as, both at Corinth and at Ephesus, having a church in their house (Rom 16:3-5; 1 Cor. 16:19); meaning, not the whole church in

3 Grace to you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.
4 I thank my God, making mention of thee always in my prayers,

3 Grace to you, and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.
4 I thank my God always, making mention of thee

these cities, but a section of it, a house congregation, precisely as in a large or scattered church now, portions of it meet for social worship in different neighborhoods. (Acts 12: 12; 16: 40; Rom. 16: 14, 15.) Possibly some of the slaves of Philemon, who formed a part of his household, were members of the church, and it might be desirable, as Chrysostom suggests, to conciliate them, and awaken in them proper sentiments toward the returning fugitive. Hence, not the master only, but the whole family, the wife, son, and slaves, so far as they are Christians, are addressed, and the appeal is made to the hearts of all in behalf of Onesimus. At the same time he could not address them separately as slaves, both because an appeal to them in such a connection might be offensive to the master, and because, as the same Father adds, "the church knows not the distinction of master and slave" (Gal. 3: 28); hence he addressed the section of the church meeting with Philemon and including his Christian slaves. In another epistle, sent at the same time, he commends Onesimus to the whole church. (Col. 4: 9.)

3. Grace to you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ—the usual form of invocation in all the Pauline Epistles, except First and Second Timothy and Hebrews. 'Grace': the free, unmerited favor of God, through which salvation is bestowed. 'Peace': that salvation as experienced in the soul. The former designates the source of salvation, God's free, self-originated favor; the latter, the result of salvation, as subjectively realized in the soul, in a new life of peace with God. The union of Christ with the Father in such an invocation, making him alike with the Father, the source of 'grace' and 'peace,' could only be impious, if the apostle did not regard him as one in nature and equal with God the Father.

4-7. THANKSGIVING FOR PHILEMON'S LOVE AND FAITH.—1. The apostle gives thanks to God always for him, making mention of him in his prayers, through occasion of the reports that come respecting his love to Christians and faith toward Christ. (4, 5.) 2. The purport of his prayer for him is that the exercise of kindness to the saints, which his faith had prompted, might lead to the full development in him of all those possibilities of excellence of character, which, by God's grace, are in us, and thus Christ be glorified in him. (6.) 3. The motive or subjective grounds of the prayer is the joy and consolation Paul experienced by occasion of Philemon's love, in that the hearts of the saints are refreshed by him. (7.)

4. I thank my God—compare the very similar thought and expression (Rom. 1: 8-10; 1 Cor. 1: 4; Phil. 1: 3, 4; 1 Thess. 1: 2, 3; 2 Thess. 1: 3), 'My God': "it is the privilege of good men that in their praises and prayers they come to God as *their* God; '*Our God we thank thee*,' said David, and '*I thank my God*,' said Paul." (Henry.) "In thus thanking God for what Philemon was, we see the apostle's habit of recognizing the graces of Christians as the fruits of grace." (Hackett.) **Making mention of thee always in my prayers.** The manner in which his thankfulness found expression: it was in thankful intercession for him. (Eph. 1: 15, 16.) Note the unselfish and all comprehending character of Paul's prayers. So broad was his spiritual sympathy, that he daily spread out before God the condition and needs of the multitude of churches and of fellow laborers, with whom he was connected as spiritual leader, evidently mentioning them by name, and entering into their circumstances and special necessities with great particularity. Compare the passages above cited. Thus Luther, in the most exciting and crowded epochs of his career, when the cause of the Reformation throughout Germany lay on his heart, is said to have spent three hours daily in prayer. Our Lord himself, amidst the intense and blessed activities of his wonderful life, probably often "continued the whole night in prayer," or, "rising up a great while before day, departed into a solitary place, and there prayed." Nor was this the outpouring of a mere ecstatic devotion; his people and their needs formed the subject of these solitary pleadings (Luke 22: 32; John 17: 20); and these intercessions, begun on earth, he continues evermore before the throne in heaven. (Rom. 8: 34; Heb. 9:

5 Hearing of thy love and faith, which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and toward all saints;
6 That the communication of thy faith may become effectual by the acknowledging of every good thing which is in you in Christ Jesus.
7 For we have great joy and consolation in thy love, because the bowels of the saints are refreshed by thee, brother.

5 in my prayers, hearing of [1] thy love, and of the faith
which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and toward
6 all the saints; that the fellowship of thy faith may
become effectual in the knowledge of every good
7 thing which is in [2] you, unto Christ. For I had
much joy and comfort in thy love, because the
hearts of the saints have been refreshed through
thee, brother.

1 Or, *thy love and faith*.....2 Many ancient authorities read *us*.

25; 1 John 2:1.) In sympathy with Christ, the apostle, in like manner, bore upon his heart before God the needs not only of the churches in general, but of the individual souls with whom he was placed in more immediate contact.

5. Hearing—or, *while I hear*, or, *am* (often) *hearing*, perhaps from Onesimus, Epaphras, who was then in Rome (Col. 1:7; 4:12), and other disciples from Colosse. This clause expresses the occasion of Paul's thanksgiving and prayer: he was constantly hearing of Philemon's steadfastness and generous hospitality and kindness to the saints. **Of thy love and faith, which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and toward all saints.** The clauses here are transposed, making the figure called *chiasm*, which might readily occur in an informal, friendly letter, especially in a writer like Paul, in whom thought often outruns expression, and several thoughts seem to be struggling for utterance at the same moment. The logical order is: While I hear of thy faith toward Christ and of thy love unto all the saints. The occasion of his thanksgiving and prayer for Philemon is the constant report of Philemon's Christian character and kindness. (Col. 3:3, 4; 3 John 2-6.)

6. That—connected with ver. 4, as expressing the end or purport of the prayer. **The communication of thy faith**—that is, the liberality or kindness shown to the saints, which is the fruit of thy faith. See Rom. 15:26; 2 Cor. 8:4; 9:13; Phil. 1:5; Heb. 13:16), in all which this word (κοινωνία) is used in the sense of *contribution*, the imparting of one's good to others. **May become effectual by the acknowledging of every good thing which is in you in Christ Jesus**—better, as in the Revised Version, *in the knowledge of every good thing which is in you, unto Christ*—that is, in the full recognition and consequent possession of every grace and power that the Holy Spirit has implanted in you, unto (the glory of) Christ. Nothing spiritually good dwells in us by nature (Rom. 7:18); but grace implants a new principle or potency of holiness (John 4:14; 1 John 3:8), which is to be developed in all moral and spiritual excellencies, to the glory of Christ. This new principle of holiness finds its development in the exercise of an unselfish Christian benevolence: this is the element in which it grows and reaches its full, blessed fruitage in a holy character. The apostle's prayer is, that, through the exercise of these offices of kindness to the saints by Philemon, which are prompted by his faith, he may attain the perfect knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις), the knowledge which comes by actual possession of every grace of experience and character which is made possible to us by the new spiritual nature that, through God's gift, is in us. Compare the parallel prayer, Phil. 1:9-11. "It is beautifully presupposed here that 'whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report,' they all (πᾶν ἀγαθόν) have their proper dwelling place and home in the bosoms of Christians, and that it is their duty, as it should be their glory, to furnish to the world the outward proof of this inner Christendom, and thus give, each one for himself, the evidence that the idea and the reality are not in his case separated from each other. It is thus that God is glorified. (Matt. 5:16.)" (Hackett.) 'In you': instead of this, most of the best manuscripts read *in us*, a reading adopted by nearly all editors. The Sinaitic, however, reads *in you*. *Unto Christ* (εἰς Χριστόν) is that to which a Christian is eternally dedicated, the goal of all his living, all his experience, all development of character—whatever he is or does, or aspires to be or to do, all has for its end the glory of Christ. (Titus 2:14.)

7. For we have great joy and consolation in thy love—or, *by occasion of thy love*—the subjective ground, or subordinate motive,

8 Wherefore, though I might be much bold in Christ
to enjoin thee that which is convenient,
9 Yet for love's sake I rather beseech *thee*, being such
a one as Paul the aged, and now also a prisoner of Jesus
Christ.
10 I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have
begotten in my bonds:

8 Wherefore, though I have all boldness in Christ to
9 enjoin thee that which is befitting, yet for love's
sake I rather beseech, being such a one as Paul [1]the
10 aged, and now a prisoner also of Christ Jesus. I
beseech thee for my child, whom I have begotten

1 Or, *an ambassador, and now, etc.*

for this thanksgiving and prayer was the joy and consolation he found in the reports of Philemon's love to all the saints. (Phil. 4:1; Col. 2:5; 1 Thess. 2:19, 20; 3:9, 10.) 'We have'—the oldest manuscripts have, *I had.* **Because the bowels of the saints are refreshed by the brother.** 'The bowels'—or, more properly, the nobler viscera, regarded as the seat of the affections, *the heart.* The reference is, at least in part, to the hospitality which Philemon showed to the ministers of Christ on their missionary journeys. His large-hearted generosity and kindness had refreshed and cheered them in their work. (Titus 3:13; 3 John 6.) 'Brother'—placed last for emphasis of affection, and doubtless by its tender associations designed to prepare the way for the appeal which follows. Compare (in the Greek) Gal. 6:18.

8-21. Appeal of Paul to Philemon in Behalf of Onesimus, a Fugitive Slave, Entreating that he would Receive him Back with Favor.

I. **8, 9.** *Waiving his right, as an apostle to command, Paul, in deference to the claims of love, chooses rather to use entreaty, commending it to his regard as coming from Paul the aged, and now also a prisoner of Christ.* **Wherefore**—that is, since I have these evidences of thy faith and love. **Though I might be much bold in Christ** (*by virtue of my relation to Christ*) **to enjoin thee that which is convenient** (*fitting*). He has authority as an apostle of Christ to lay as an injunction on Philemon that which is morally fitting; and he reminds him of this, in order to suggest that the request he is about to make is right and fitting in itself. "*That which is ethically suitable*—thus Paul makes that which he desires to obtain from Philemon, already to be felt as a duty." (Meyer.) **Yet for love's sake**—having respect to the claims of love. "It is not Philemon's love (ver. 5, 7), nor St. Paul's own love, but love absolutely, love regarded as a principle which demands a deferential respect." (Lightfoot.) **I rather beseech thee**—rather than command, which as an apostle was his right. **Being such a one as Paul the aged, and now also a prisoner of Jesus Christ.** He adds force to the entreaty by presenting these two affecting facts in his personal condition: (*a*) He is 'Paul the aged'; and regard might well be felt to the request of an old servant of Christ, especially one from him who bore that loved name. It is not certain what Paul's precise age was at this time. But if, as is generally supposed, he had been a member of the Sanhedrin, he must have been considerably past thirty at his coversion A. D. 36; and as this Epistle was written A.D. 62, he would be, at the time of writing this Epistle, nearly or quite sixty. A life of severe toil and hardship, with constant bodily infirmities, had doubtless made him old in appearance and feeling at this age. Lightfoot, with less probability, translates: *Paul, an ambassador*, and takes these two clauses as giving the ground of his authority to command; adducing in support of this view Eph. 6:20, "an ambassador in bonds," and several instances where this word (πρεσβύτης) is used for an *ambassador.* Thus, also, Westcott and Hort. (*b*) He is now 'a prisoner of Jesus Christ'; being now in bonds at Rome for the sake of his Master, and entitled to special consideration as thus suffering for the gospel.

II. **10-12.** *The apostle's appeal is for a spiritual child, begotten in his bonds. Onesimus, once, indeed, unprofitable, but now, by his changed character, profitable; whom he sends back, though, in so doing, he is sending his very heart.* **I beseech thee for my son, Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds**—rather, *for my child, whom I begat in my bonds, Onesimus.* Having thus favorably disposed the mind of Philemon, he now discloses the name of him for whom he intercedes; preparing the way for this, however, with two propitiatory considerations: (*a*) He is Paul's spiritual child, having been led to Christ by the apostle. (*b*) He was converted when Paul was in prison, and was thus spe-

11 Which in time past was to thee unprofitable, but
now profitable to thee and to me:
12 Whom I have sent again: thou therefore receive
him, that is, mine own bowels:
13 Whom I would have retained with me, that in thy
stead he might have ministered unto me in the bonds
of the gospel:
14 But without thy mind would I do nothing; that
thy benefit should not be as it were of necessity, but
willingly.

11 in my bonds, [1]Onesimus, who was aforetime un-
profitable to thee, but now is profitable to thee and
12 to me: whom I have sent back to thee in his own
13 person, that is, my very heart: whom I fain would
have kept with me, that in thy behalf he might
14 minister unto me in the bonds of the gospel: but
without thy mind I would do nothing; that thy
goodness should not be as of necessity, but of free

1 The Greek word means *Helpful.*

cially dear to him. 'Begotten.' Compare 1 Cor. 4:5, as also Gal. 4:19, where he likens his anxieties to the birth-pangs of a mother. 'Onesimus'—the name signifies *useful, profitable.* He was a slave of Philemon, of Colosse, who had run away from his master, and at Rome had been converted. When sent back, in company with Tychicus, he is commended to the Colossian Church as "a faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you." (Col. 4:9.) **Which in time past was to thee unprofitable, but now profitable to thee and to me**—a play on the significance of his name. Once he belied his name, in that, instead of *profitable*, he proved *unprofitable* to thee; but now, since his conversion, he justifies his name, by a spirit and conduct which make him *profitable*, and that, not only to thee, but also to me. "To his master he is now to be a benefit, since he serves him better than before; to the apostle, on the contrary, he is to be such, since he is a fruit of his labor, and to be his rejoicing in the day of Christ." (Van Oosterzee.) Names among the Orientals are significant, expressive of something in their experience or character or prospects, and stress was often laid upon this significance. (Gen. 17:15; 32:28; Ruth 1:20.) **Whom I have sent again**—or, *sent back to thee in his own person.* Onesimus accompanied the letter. (Col. 4:9.) There is no evidence that he was sent back without his own consent; on the contrary, all the circumstances point to his own active concurrence in his return. **Thou, therefore, receive him, that is, mine own bowels.** The words: 'Thou, therefore, receive him,' of the Received Text, are wanting in the best manuscripts. With these omitted, it is as if he had said: "I have sent him back, though in sending him I am sending my very heart, so dear is he to me." "The person beloved is called the heart itself, because he occupies so large a place in the affections." (Hackett.)

VII. 13, 14. *He would fain, indeed, have retained Onesimus with himself, to render, in behalf of his master, service to him in his bonds, but would do nothing without Philemon's consent, that such a kindness, if done at all, might be, on the part of Philemon, not of necessity, but of free will.* **Whom I would have retained with me**—or, *could have wished to retain with me*—or, "would fain have kept with me"—that is, if it had been proper, had it been best, thus to do. For this use of the Greek imperfect tense, called the *inchoative imperfect*, compare Acts 25:22; Rom. 9:3; Gal. 4:20. "The imperfect of this and similar verbs is not unfrequently used where the wish is stopped at the outset by some antecedent consideration which renders it impossible, and thus practically is not entertained at all." (Lightfoot.) 'I'—emphatic. *I, on my part, could have wished.* **That in thy stead he might have ministered unto me.** In this long imprisonment, though "dwelling in his own hired house," he was chained to a Roman soldier; and, thus fettered in his personal movements, he would need many services such as a devoted and helpful young man could render. 'In thy *stead*'—he assumes that were Philemon there in person, he would gladly and gratefully render such service to him, since he owes him "even his own self." (19.) **In the bonds of the gospel**—the bonds which his service in the gospel had occasioned—that gospel which had brought to Philemon eternal life. **But without thy mind would I do nothing.** He would not act on the mere assumption of Philemon's willingness; for, in that case, the *kindness* of Philemon, through the service rendered by Onesimus to Paul, might have seemed extorted, rather than freely bestowed. **That thy benefit should not be as it were of necessity**—as it might be, or at least, might seem to be, if he retained Onesimus on the assumption of Philemon's consent. **But willingly** (*of free will*). He will not have

15 For perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldest receive him for ever;
16 Not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much more unto thee, both in the flesh, and in the Lord?

15 will. For perhaps he was therefore parted *from thee* for a season, that thou shouldest have him for ever;
16 no longer as a [1]servant, but more than a [1]servant, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much rather to thee, both in the flesh and in the

1 Gr. *bondservant.*

Philemon's kindness, in granting the service of Onesimus to him, even appear as a matter of constraint, but will have it appear, as it would be in fact if accorded, a favor freely bestowed.

IV. **15, 16.** *Reason for a kind reception of Onesimus, founded on the possible design of Providence in his flight; since it was, perchance, God's design, in the temporary separation of the slave, that, through his conversion, he might be restored to his master forever, no longer in the old relation of slave, but in the new and higher one of a Christian brother, dear to the apostle, but doubly dear to him. If, then, Philemon regards the apostle as a sharer with him in the gospel, he will receive Onesimus in such manner as he would receive Paul himself.* **For**—another reason for the cordial reception of Onesimus: Providence had marvelously interposed to overrule whatever had been wrong, and had thus presented a new aspect of the flight of the slave. Many recent interpreters regard the 'for' as presenting an additional reason for sending, rather than retaining, Onesimus; but, as this is only incidental it seems far more probable that Paul, after the digression (ver. 13, 14) resumes by this word, as so often in his epistles, the main course of his reasoning for the kind reception of the fugitive. **Perhaps he therefore departed for a season** (*was parted from thee for a season*) **that thou shouldst receive him forever**—*receive him* (ἀπέχῃς). "This peculiar word, as applied here to the new spiritual bond, was suggested perhaps by the civil relations of the parties to each other. It signifies *to have in full, to possess exhaustively*, and hence the meaning here is that Philemon, in gaining Onesimus as a Christian brother, had come into a relationship to him which made him all his own, and forever (αἰώνιον)." (Hackett.) 'For a season'—literally, *for an hour*—that is, for a very brief period, contrasted with 'forever.' Compare 2 Cor. 7:8; Gal. 2:5; 1 Thess. 2:17. It perhaps suggests that Onesimus had not been long parted from his master. The apostle conceives here of the whole transaction, as seen from the standpoint of the divine purpose, as a part of God's providence; and hence he does not say, "on this account he *fled*," but, "on this account he *was parted* from thee." Thus Joseph, though sold into bondage by the wickedness of his brethren, when speaking of the transaction as a part of God's providential plan, says to them, "God did send me before you to preserve life." (Gen. 45:5.) Whatever the human motives in Onesimus' flight, God's providence, of which it formed a part, overruled it for his high purposes. The brief separation had resulted in Onesimus' salvation. He had left Colosse a wicked, ungodly man; he was returning a redeemed saint. The relation of master and slave, as before existing was temporary, terminating with death; the relation, as now existing, in its new and higher scope, when both were Christians, was eternal and indissoluble. **Not now as a servant** (*slave*)**, but above a servant** (*slave*)**, a brother beloved.** He would, indeed, have him as his own forever, but in a wholly changed relation. Though Onesimus might not be manumitted, and before the Roman law might remain a slave, yet he could no longer be to Philemon *as a slave.* The new and higher relation of a brother in Christ threw into the background, and made as of no account, the old and earthly relation; for in the brotherhood of the saints there is "neither bond nor free, but Christ is all and in all." (Col. 3:11.) The common union of master and slave to Christ made them morally equal, as one in him, and placed them on the same footing in the kingdom of God, as alike redeemed from sin and its power, and alike made heirs of the heavenly inheritance. **Specially to me**—*specially beloved*—as being his son in the faith, and as having ministered to him in his imprisonment. **But how much more unto thee, both in the flesh and in the Lord**—as a member of thy household, and as a fellow believer in Christ. 'In the flesh, and in the Lord'—"specifies the two domains in which Onesimus will be to him yet far more a beloved brother than to the apostle, namely,

17 If thou count me therefore a partner, receive him as myself.
18 If he hath wronged thee, or oweth *thee* aught, put that on mine account;
19 I Paul have written *it* with mine own hand, I will repay *it:* albeit I do not say to thee how thou owest unto me even thine own self besides.
20 Yea, brother, let me have joy of thee in the Lord: refresh my bowels in the Lord.

17 Lord. If then thou countest me a partner, receive
18 him as myself. But if he hath wronged thee at all,
19 or oweth *thee* aught, put that to mine account; I Paul write it with mine own hand, I will repay it: that I say not unto thee how that thou owest to me
20 even thine own self besides. Yea, brother, let me have [1]joy of thee in the Lord: refresh my heart in Christ.

1 Or, *help.*

in the flesh—that is, in the sphere pertaining to the *material* nature of man, in things consequently that concern the bodily life and needs, and *in the Lord*, that is, in the higher *spiritual life-sphere* of fellowship with Christ." (Meyer.) **If thou count me therefore a partner**—that is, a partaker with thee of the Christian faith and hope. The word, in this relation, has the idea of an intimate friend, but one who is such in consequence of sharing, in common with the speaker, in the interests, feelings, and hopes of the gospel. The apostle thus distinctly makes the case of Onesimus his own, and asks his kind reception on the ground of the Christian friendship existing between himself and Philemon. **Receive him as myself**—receive him with all the favor, kindness, friendship with which thou wouldest receive me. "What joy would have entered the abode of Philemon, if the captive apostle had suddenly and unexpectedly stood before their eyes in the possession of his recovered liberty! Such a reception he now wishes that Onesimus may enjoy in the house of his master." (Van Oosterzee.)

V. **18-21.** *Whatever wrong or debt is chargeable to Onesimus, the apostle requests may be placed to his account, and promises, over his own signature, to make good; reminding Philemon, however, that, as indebted to him for the knowledge of Christ, he owes the apostle far more, even his own self, and closing with an expression of confidence that Philemon will do even more than is asked.* **If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee aught.** 'If'—not as if this were doubtful. It is the *if* of concession—seeing he has wronged thee. He concedes that Philemon had been wronged. **Put that on mine account.** Whether the wrong, or debt, here referred to consisted in a robbery of his master, the consequences of which Onesimus had sought to escape by flight, or consisted simply in the wrong done by his clandestine flight and the consequent loss of his service, cannot be certainly determined. The hypothetical form in which it is presented is supposed by some to favor the latter supposition. But whatever the cause of the damage or debt, the apostle wishes it charged to himself, as to be made good by him. 'Put that on mine account'—though his debt, nevertheless reckon it as mine. Compare the only other use of the verb (Rom. 5 13), where it is rendered *imputed.* Here the apostle asks that the debt, actually incurred by another, be *imputed*, reckoned to him.

19. I Paul have written it with mine own hand. I will repay it. He thus signs his name, as to a bond. In the same way, he attests his epistles by his signature. (1 Cor. 16: 21; Col. 4 : 18; 2 Thess. 3 : 17.) In this instance, it is possible that the entire Epistle was written by his own hand; most of the others seem to have been penned by an amanuensis, Paul simply adding a few words to attest them. (Rom. 16 : 22.) **Albeit I do not say to thee how thou owest unto me even thine own self besides.** Philemon had received the knowledge of salvation from Paul; he owed to the apostle, therefore, himself, in the highest sense, in all that belonged to his spiritual life and hope. Compare Luke 9 : 25. 'Besides'—in addition to that which I have declared my readiness to pay. Paul had begotten him in the gospel, and he was indebted thus for his very being, as a Christian, to the apostle; a debt transcendently greater than any the slave could owe his master. The argument in this verse is serious and valid; but the delicate aroma of pleasantry with which it is invested suggests that the apostle, with all the weight of care resting on him, was not devoid of humor, to relieve the graver side of his character and give vivacity to his ordinary intercourse with others.

20. Yea, brother, let me have joy (*profit*) **of thee.** The emphasis is on *me.* He makes the cause of Onesimus his own; and Philemon, in receiving the fugitive kindly,

21 Having confidence in thy obedience I wrote unto thee, knowing that thou wilt also do more than I say.
22 But withal prepare me also a lodging: for I trust that through your prayers I shall be given unto you.

21 Having confidence in thine obedience I write unto thee, knowing that thou wilt do even beyond what
22 I say. But withal prepare me also a lodging: for I hope that through your prayers I shall be granted unto you.

will be conferring favor, comfort, on Paul himself. *It is I*, not Onesimus, who will thus have profit, joy, from thee. *Profit*—alluding in the verb used (ὀναίμην) to the name (Onesimus—*profitable*) of him for whom he is pleading. The verb is, in this case, all the more expressive in that it is commonly used to express the comfort, help, a parent should receive from a child. As if he had said: I send Onesimus (the profitable one) to thee; do thou, by thy Christian reception of him, send an Onesimus (profit) to me. Let me have joy, by knowing that, with true Christian nobleness, thou dost forgive his flight, and welcome him to thy heart as a brother in Christ. **In the Lord**—the sphere of the joy, or profit, he sought. It was not selfish and carnal, but spiritual joy. **Refresh my bowels in the Lord.** Paul's heart had been burdened in reference to this matter; he would receive refreshing, spiritual relief and comfort, in Philemon's cordial reception of the returning fugitive. The gravest consequences might follow an opposite course on the part of Philemon. A fugitive slave was generally treated with great cruelty. He was tortured, or maimed, or sent to the quarries and mines, or even crucified, at the command of an angry master. Such conduct in a Christian master would discredit the highest teachings of the gospel, and utterly misrepresent its spirit before the world. The moral and spiritual equality of master and slave in the church, also, would be seriously compromised, if Philemon refused to recognize the new relation in which Onesimus now stood as a brother in the Lord. The case of the returning Christian slave was, therefore, of most serious import, not simply as it affected Onesimus himself, but also as it stood related to the Christian religion before the world and in the church; and it might well lie as a burden on Paul's heart, till it was settled by Philemon's reception of Onesimus in the true spirit of the gospel and with the full recognition of his new position as a Christian.

21. Having confidence in thy obedience, I wrote unto thee. He would not have Philemon feel that this urgency of entreaty arose from distrust of his love and obedience; while yet, by the use of the word 'obedience' he delicately hints at his apostolic right to command. **Knowing that thou wilt also do more than I say.** He is confident that his friend will even surpass in his kindness what has been asked. Whether this excess in Philemon's fulfillment of Paul's request refers to some special favor, not formally asked, as Onesimus' legal manumission, making him a freedman, cannot be determined. Alford, Hackett, and most commentators interpret the words, as probably hinting at manumission. Meyer and Ellicott quite decidedly dissent from this view. But whatever may be the fact as to the legal relation, Wordsworth has well said: "By Christianizing the master, the gospel enfranchised the slave. It did not legislate about mere names and forms, but it went to the root of the evil—it spoke to the heart of man. When the heart of the master was filled with divine grace, and was warmed with the love of Christ, the rest would soon follow. The lips would speak kind words; the hands would do liberal things. Every Onesimus would be treated by every Philemon as a beloved brother in Christ."

22-25. Closing Directions and Salutations, with the Benediction.

22. But withal prepare me also a lodging. Together with, and in addition to this kind reception of Onesimus, be preparing a lodging for me. "The request for such hospitality . . . . would serve also indirectly to enforce Paul's application for Onesimus. Who could be willing to disappoint the beloved apostle, and compel him in person to see how little regard had been paid to his request?" (Van Oosterzee.) Thus also, Meyer, and most interpreters. It was Paul's original intention, after visiting Rome, to go thence to to Spain (Rom. 15:24, 28), but his plans have changed, as he is now expecting to go to Philippi (Phil. 2:24), and also to Colosse. 'Lodging'—this may mean a lodging which should be hired for him, or an entertainment as guest at Philemon's house. Paul thus courteously refrained from assuming that his friend would entertain him, although this was doubtless the

23 There salute thee Epaphras, my fellow prisoner in Christ Jesus;
24 Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Lucas, my fellow labourers.
25 The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *be* with your spirit. Amen.

23 Epaphras, my fellow-prisoner in Christ Jesus,
24 saluteth thee; *and so do* Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, Luke, my fellow-workers.
25 The grace of [1]our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit. [2]Amen.

1 Some ancient authorities read *the*.....2 Many ancient authorities omit *Amen*.

result. **For I trust that through your prayers I shall be given unto you**—'given'—"liberated in favor of you." (Acts 3: 14; 27: 24.) The word denotes the granting of something in answer to a request. 'Through your prayers'—the means through which the favor was obtained. (Acts 12: 5; 2 Cor. 1: 11; Phil. 1: 19; Col. 4: 3.) The expectation here expressed of release and of further missionary work, also appears in another epistle written about this time (Phil. 1: 19-26; 2: 24); and the probability is that, after the release, he actually visited these places, as here indicated.

23. There salute thee. The persons mentioned here, as sending salutations, are the same as those named in the Epistle to the Colossians, which accompanied this; except in the omission here of "Jesus, which is called Justus." (Col. 4: 10-14.) **Epaphras, my fellow prisoner in Christ Jesus.** He was a presbyter of the church in Colosse, but was at this time with the apostle at Rome, and was apparently sharing his imprisonment. As in Colossians, he is called a "fellow laborer," and Aristarchus, a "fellow prisoner," it is possible, as Meyer suggests, that these attendants of Paul voluntarily took turns in ministering to him in his place of confinement (an arrangement quite conceivable in the freer position he enjoyed in this first Roman imprisonment, when he "dwelt in his own hired house"); and hence one at one time, and another at another, would be Paul's "fellow prisoner." Epaphras was an eminently useful and zealous servant of Christ, of whom the apostle, when commending him to the Colossians, speaks, as a "dear fellow servant, who is for you a faithful minister of Christ," "laboring fervently for you in prayers," "having a great zeal for you, and for them that are in Laodicea, and them in Hieropolis." He has been supposed to be the same as Epaphroditus, mentioned in Phil. 2: 15, as the name is the same, only abbreviated, but it seems fatal to this that Epaphroditus was not of Colosse but of Philippi, and had been sent to Rome from that city, whereas Epaphras was sent there from Colosse. (Phil. 2: 25; Col. 1: 7; 4: 12.)

24. Marcus—John Mark, cousin of Barnabas (Acts 12: 12, 25), who accompanied Paul and Barnabas as far as Perga on the first mission, and was afterward refused by Paul, when proposed for the second mission. (Acts 13: 13; 15: 38.) Here, it is evident, he has been again admitted among the attendants of the apostle. Tradition holds him as the author of the second gospel. **Aristarchus**—a Thessalonian, who, with Gaius, was caught and dragged into the theatre by the mob at Ephesus, was with Paul when he returned from Corinth to Asia, and, accompanying him to Rome, is mentioned as a "fellow prisoner" with him there. (Acts 19: 29; 20: 4; 27: 2; Col. 4: 10.) **Demas**—a name here honorably associated with Paul's fellow laborers in Rome; but, in the apostle's second imprisonment there, he deserted him, "having loved this present world." Whether this indicated a permanent or only a temporary failure of his Christian life is uncertain. (2 Tim. 4: 10.) **Lucas**—the Evangelist Luke, author of the Third Gospel and of the Acts. He is called "the beloved physician"; and possibly as Paul's health was suffering, especially on his second mission, when Luke comes first into connection with him, he may have acted as his physician, as well as fellow laborer. Singularly modest, he makes his presence or absence in the apostolic company known in the Acts only by the use of the pronoun of the first or the third persons; but it is evident that he spent a large part of his life with the apostle. (Col. 4: 14; 2 Tim. 4: 11.) See note in that place. **My fellow labourers.** The wonderful power of Paul is seen in the attracting to himself, and the inspiring to evangelical work, of the large body of assistants, who are constantly either laboring with him, or performing service in different parts of the world under his direction.

25. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit. Amen. The shorter benediction. (Gal. 6: 18; 2 Tim. 4: 22.) 'Your spirit';

the pronoun 'you' is plural, because including with Philemon, Apphia, Archippus, and the church in Philemon's house. (Ver. 2.) It invokes on their spirit the free, rich favor of Christ, with all the fullness of blessing it brings. 'Amen': not in the authoritative manuscripts. The subscription here, as in the other epistles, has no authority.

"Among the old manuscripts there are two which record at the end that Onesimus had his legs broken on the rack on the cross at Rome, and so gained the rewards of martyrdom. And with this thought, not perhaps historically confirmed, but so entirely in harmony with the vicissitudes of that age of the first confessors, we may turn our eyes from this record of lowly life on earth, upward to the scene where the Lord's servants, though they may have been the slaves of men, are exalted and ennobled forever on thrones which he has prepared for them." (Hackett.)

COMMENTARY

ON THE

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

BY
A. C. KENDRICK, D. D.

PHILADELPHIA:
AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
1701-1703 CHESTNUT STREET.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1889, by the
AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

INTRODUCTION TO THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

THREE among the New Testament Epistles may be regarded as of pre-eminent interest and importance—namely, that to the Romans, the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and the Epistle to the Hebrews. They differ, indeed, widely in purpose and character. The Epistle to the Romans is an exposition, welling up from the large soul and ripe experience of the Apostle Paul, of the fundamental character, and world-wide relations of the gospel. That to the Corinthians applies the principles of the gospel to the correction of grave abuses and errors which had become rife in one of the most prominent New Testament Churches. The Epistle to the Hebrews, addressed to a body of believing Jews—whether a single church or an aggregation of churches—seeks to hold them back from a threatened apostasy to Judaism by exhibiting the transcendent superiority of the New Covenant to the symbolical and transitory system to which they were returning. The Epistle is thus more fundamental in character and scope than that to the Corinthians, and yields in depth of view and the vital importance of its teachings, only to the Epistle to the Romans. Indeed, selecting from the world's entire literature two among its most remarkable productions, we should readily designate, I think, the Epistles to the Romans and the Hebrews. To the former must be accorded the superiority in breadth, comprehensiveness, and power; it glows throughout with the fiery energy of the great Christian Demosthenes. The latter, apparently narrower in scope, makes up in depth what it lacks in breadth; in calm majesty what it lacks in vehemence; and pursues its even and tranquil course with an earnestness and intensity of purpose which are in striking contrast with the placid smoothness of the style.

But apart from style the Epistle to the Hebrews presents some aspects of striking peculiarity. The authorship, date, purpose, and destination of the Epistle to the Romans lie in the clearest sunlight; that to the Hebrews is in all these points enveloped in an almost impenetrable obscurity. It presents the singular problem of a composition written in the very blaze of the early Christian period, on a practical topic of momentous interest, by a man certainly of virtual apostolic dignity, yet over whose authorship, date, place of composition, and immediate destination hangs a mystery like that which surrounds its own Melchisedec. These successive topics I will briefly notice.

I. AUTHORSHIP.

1. CURRENT TRADITION.

Current tradition in the church has assigned this Epistle to the Apostle Paul, and the question of authorship turns largely on settling the grounds of this tradition. The evidence divides itself into two branches—external or historical, and internal. Looking first at the former we find that in the Eastern Church the Epistle was from the first regarded as canonical, and was in some form generally attributed to Paul. Pantænus, Clement.

and Origen, the successive heads of the Alexandrian Catechetical School (180–250 A. D.), all regard it in a qualified sense as his. Pantænus, the first whom we know to have attached to it the name of the apostle, mentions as an objection to this view the absence in its opening of Paul's customary form of salutation, but explains it (fancifully, I think) from the apostle's unwillingness to put himself into seeming rivalry with his Lord, God's special apostle (Ἀπόστολος) to the Hebrews. (Eusebius' "Hist. Eccles." VI. 14, 4.) Clement, his pupil, finds a weightier objection. He sees in the style the characteristics rather of Luke than of Paul, and solves the difficulty by supposing that Paul composed it in Aramaic, and Luke, his companion, rendered it into Greek. (Eusebius' "Hist. Eccles." VI. 14, 2–4.) So Origen, while repeatedly citing the Epistle as Paul's, and declaring it worthy of him in its wonderful depth of thought, yet regards the style as quite unlike his and far more classical. "For no slight reasons," he says, "have ancient men handed down the Epistle as Paul's, though by whom it was actually written God only knows. Tradition ascribes it partly to Clement, Bishop of Rome, and partly to Luke." (Eusebius' "Hist. Eccles." VI. 25, 11.) Whether these critical doubts died away or not, the later Alexandrians, as Dionysius (about 250), Alexander (about 312), Athanasius (died 373), Didymus (died 395), etc., simply cite the Epistle as Paul's.

In Syria the admission of the Epistle into the Peshito version (in the latter half of the second century) shows its standing as canonical, though it appears as anonymous, and nothing indicates it as being considered Pauline. Yet the later Syrian Church generally held to its Pauline origin. Jacob, Bishop of Nisibis (about 325), cites it as from an apostle, presumably from Paul; and his disciple, Ephraem Syrus (died 378), refers it unhesitatingly to Paul; and in Western Syria the Synod of Antioch (264), in an Epistle to Paul of Samosata, couples citations from it with passages from the Corinthians as belonging to the same author.

Elsewhere in the Eastern Church the view became general which ascribed the Epistle to Paul. Eusebius of Cæsarea (300–350) repeatedly refers to it as his, and enumerates fourteen of his Epistles, thus clearly embracing this. ("Hist. Eccles." III. 3, 5.) Yet he speaks of those in the Roman Church who denied its Pauline origin, and he himself, like Clement of Alexandria, regards it as a translation from a Hebrew original of the apostle ("Hist. Eccles." III. 38, 23); and he elsewhere classes it along with the Wisdom of Solomon and that of Jesus, son of Sirach, and the Epistles of Barnabas, the Roman Clement, and Jude, among the works that are disputed (γραφαὶ ἀντιλεγόμεναι, VI. 13. 6). It is attributed, however, immediately to Paul in the sixtieth canon of the Council at Laodicea (about 350), by Titus of Bostra (died 371), by Basil the Great (died 379), and his brother, Gregory of Nyssa; by Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem (died 386); by Gregory Nazianzen (died 389), by Epiphanius (died 402), by Chrysostom (died 407), by Theodore of Mopsuestia, and others. Also Theodoret (died 457), in the introduction to his interpretation of the Epistle; still he does this to contend against the Arians, who rejected it as un-Pauline and uncanonical.

The Eastern Church thus early regarded the Epistle as from Paul, though not until a late period as proceeding from him in its present form. The weighty authority of the Alexandrian Fathers—Pantænus, Clement, Origen—turns, from our point of view, rather against the Pauline authorship, when we reflect that it was probably because the stamp of apostolic authority was deemed necessary by them to its canonical validity, and they could give it this authority only by assuming that Paul was, at least indirectly, its author. Their reasons for denying to the apostle its immediate, and, so to speak, *literary* author-

ship, are far weightier than those which lead them to bring it within the apostolic circle. Within that circle no name but that of Paul could be connected with the Epistle to the Hebrews; and they had the discernment to see the wide difference of style and manner between this work and the acknowledged writings of the apostle.

We turn to the history of the Epistle in the Western Church. In Rome it must have been early known and highly valued, as the Roman, Clement (about 100), employs many expressions from it in his valuable Epistle to the Corinthians, though without formal citation, or any allusion to its author. Later evidence renders it improbable that he attributed it to Paul, as the canon of Muratori, belonging to the end of the second century, reckons thirteen epistles as attributed by the Roman Church to Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews being excluded from the list, and, indeed, entirely unmentioned. So Caius, Presbyter at Rome (about 210), reckoned but thirteen epistles of Paul; and Novatian (about 250), in his works, "de Trinitate," and "de Cibis Judaicis," works abounding in Biblical citations, makes no mention whatever of our Epistle, which he could hardly have refrained from doing had he recognized it as canonical, not to say Pauline. Outside of Rome, Tertullian, of the North African Church, in the close of the second, and the beginning of the third century, knows only thirteen Pauline epistles. He cites the Epistle to the Hebrews in support of his Montanistic views, and attributes it without questioning to Barnabas. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage (died 258), leaves it wholly unmentioned. Irenæus, the celebrated Bishop of Lyons (died about 202), rarely, if at all, cited the book,—certainly not in his important work against the heretics,—and is said to have denied its Pauline authorship. Such was the state of opinion regarding the Epistle in the Latin Church as late as the time of Eusebius of Cæsarea. After the middle of the fourth century the tide turned, probably under Eastern influence. Between 368 and 400, Hilary of Poitiers, Lucifer of Calaxis, C. Marius Victorinus, Philastrius of Brescia, and Ambrose of Milan, attribute it to the apostle, while Rufinus, Jerome, and Augustine (between 411 and 430) receive the opinion with hesitation. The three African Synods—of Hippo (393), and of Carthage (397, 419)—first put the express seal of the Western Church upon the canonical validity and the Pauline authorship of the Epistle; the two former, indeed, cautiously ("thirteen epistles of the Apostle Paul, and one by him to the Hebrews"); but the third decisively ("the epistles of the Apostle Paul, fourteen in number"). The decree of the councils was confirmed by the Papal See; and thence onward through the Middle Ages, with some lingering echoes of doubt among Latin writers, the voice both of the Eastern and the Western churches was unanimous down to the time of the Reformation. Of late opinions I shall speak subsequently.

2. INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

The historical testimony thus appears by no means decisive in favor of the Pauline origin of the Epistle. To the view that it came from the apostle *in its present form*, that testimony seems to me decidedly adverse. The *internal evidence*, I think, bears against it still more strongly. There is, neither in its style, nor form of doctrine, nor mode of discussion, nor historical allusions, a single feature which requires, nor, except the single allusion to Timothy (13 : 23), which would naturally lead us to attribute it to the apostle.

First. The style bears almost no similarity to that of Paul.—It has nothing of his impetuosity and abruptness, none of his favorite expressions and forms of transition; but moves on in an equable and uniform flow of quiet majesty. In his utmost intensity of

emotion the writer is never insensible to, and never sacrifices, the graces of diction. He is a rhetorician, trained in the culture of the schools, and always writing, as Paul never writes, under the habitual sway of that culture. Paul is never a rhetorician; our author is always a rhetorician. Not, indeed, that Paul does not, in the grandeur of his thought, and the native majesty and energy of his diction, often snatch spontaneously some of the highest graces of art. And not that our author, with his soul profoundly penetrated with Christian truth, does not uniformly rise above the sphere of the mere rhetorician. Yet, in his noblest flights, he neither can nor would shake off his habits of rhetorical expression—habits which are utterly alien to the mind of the apostle. Nor, while certainly inferior in finish and grace of style, can we deny to the apostle, on the whole, the superior place as a writer. His largeness and depth of view, his burning energy, his confident and majestic tread amidst the Alpine heights of divine truth, give him a Demosthenian pre-eminence in sacred oratory; and his principal epistles stand as perpetual proofs that if he often fed infantile Christians with the milk of sacred doctrine, he was able to utter among the full grown and mature a wisdom which the wisdom of this world has never transcended nor approached. The question between him and the writer to the Hebrews is not one of relative excellence, but of likeness or unlikeness. And unlike, in their native endowments and style of culture, they certainly are. The one writer would certainly never have written the opening verse of the Epistle to the Romans; still less would the other have written the sonorous and rolling periods of the opening of the Hebrews.

Second. The author of our Epistle classes himself (2 : 3) *among those who received the gospel at second hand.*—This position the Apostle Paul could never have assumed for a moment. He repels almost indignantly any lowering of himself to the second rank, and maintains that, equally with the greatest of the apostles, he stood in immediate communication with the fountain head of truth and authority. He stands on the highest level of apostolic prerogative, having seen the Lord Jesus, and received from him directly his commission.

Third. Paul was an apostle to the Gentiles.—His whole course of life kept his mind open to the world-wide scope and purpose of the gospel. Granting, then, that he might write an apostolic letter to his Jewish brethren (whom he loved, we know, with most intense and tenderest affection), it is scarcely conceivable that his discussion should not have occasionally broken over its bounds, and regarded the relations of the gospel to the world outside of Judaism. There are indeed abundant indications of our author's recognition of this universal character of the gospel. Christ tasted death for every man. He becomes the Son of man that he may share that flesh and blood of which all men are partakers, and thus, through death, deliver men from that fear of death by which universal humanity is held in bondage. Thus the idea of the all-embracing purpose of redemption certainly lies at the basis of his Christology. Yet it is presupposed and hinted at merely. In no single instance does the writer depart from the Old Testament representation of Israel as the "people of God," and declare directly its widening out to the breaking down of the separating wall, and the admission of the Gentiles to an equal standing with the Jews. The *discussion* confines itself to the Judaistic relations of the gospel almost as closely as if the Gentile world had no existence. With a concentration of view remarkable under any conditions of authorship, but wholly inconceivable in the case of the world-embracing and irrepressible spirit of the great apostle of the Gentiles, with an unswerving singleness of purpose, the writer discusses the relations

of the New Covenant to the Old almost as if the extension of that covenant to all peoples were wholly unknown to him. A discussion so conducted by one whose life and soul were absorbingly devoted to the evangelization of the Gentiles seems wholly inconceivable.

Fourth. Form of citations from the Old Testament.—Another objection to the Pauline authorship may be found in the form of the citations from the Old Testament. In his acknowledged epistles, the apostle makes his citations indifferently from the Hebrew original and from the Septuagint, translating and quoting from memory with great freedom. Our author, on the other hand, makes his citations invariably from the Septuagint, and gives no indication of even an acquaintance with the Hebrew. He quotes, too, with verbal exactness, having apparently, at least in the longer passages, the text from which he quotes before him; and Bleek has shown that in the citations from the Septuagint, wherever the readings differ, our author draws in general from the Alexandrian Codex, while Paul uses exclusively the readings of the Vatican. In their modes, too, of introducing Old Testament passages, the observing reader will find a uniform and very striking difference.

Fifth. Difference in the coloring and the prominence given to different features of the gospel.—While there is no doctrinal discrepancy, but, on the other hand, an entire harmony in the two writers' fundamental conceptions of the gospel, there is yet a wide difference in coloring, and in the prominence given to different features of it. Both hold to the pre-existence of Christ; both insist alike upon his sacrificial death. But Paul dwells much upon the resurrection of Christ, while our author makes express mention of it but once, and that in the very close of the Epistle. (13 : 20.) On the other hand, he dwells upon the ascension and the heavenly high priesthood, while Paul refers but once, and that passingly (Rom. 8 : 34), to his heavenly intercession, and in no single instance employs the designation of *high priest*, of which the name (occurring seventeen times), and the functions, are the main burden of our Epistle. So an aspect of *faith* to which Paul makes but casual allusion (2 Cor. 5 : 7) our author makes the basis of his formal definition and extended illustration (chapter 11), treating it from the Old Testament point of view, while Paul's favorite phrases, "justification," "righteousness of faith," etc. (δικαιοῦν, δικαίωσις, δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως), are entirely foreign to him These illustrations of specific differences might be greatly extended, and, in fact, drawn from every part of the Epistle. They certainly indicate no contrariety of views in the two writers. Every doctrine that is taught explicitely by the one is, I think, implied, if not expressly affirmed, in the teachings of the other. We may, I think, in fact, detect in our author traces of Pauline companionship and influence. Yet the diversities are very wide, as might be expected from different minds, subjected to widely different modes of culture, and dealing with a range of subjects exhaustless in their contents and infinite in their variety.

Sixth. Historical reference.—Finally, there is but one historical reference in our Epistle that would seem to favor its reference to Paul—namely, the relations of our author to the apostle's favorite young companion, Timothy. (13 : 23.) This, however, on close examination, seems rather to bear a different testimony. We know of no imprisonment of Timothy during the life of the apostle, a deliverance from which could here be referred to. So far as probabilities go, it would seem likely that Timothy, summoned to Paul's side in his last imprisonment, shared that imprisonment, and was released after the death of the apostle. The most plausible conjecture, therefore, warranted by this

allusion, would point to a composition of the Epistle after the death of the apostle, and would thus exclude him from the number of possible candidates for its authorship. With any known event during the apostle's life it is wholly out of harmony; and, so far as this goes, it bears against the view which puts his name at the head of the Epistle.

Most of the above objections are equally adverse to any form of Pauline authorship, whether immediate, or by a dictation of the substance put into form by another, or through an Aramaic original translated into Greek by a friend or disciple. Indeed, we may dismiss at once, and finally, the idea that the work is a translation. Its rhetoric, its Septuagint quotations are against it, and nothing whatever in the Epistle favors it. If any New Testament work, this surely bears the impress of an original.

To whom, then, are we to assign the Epistle? Antiquity connects with it, besides the name of Paul, the names of Clement of Rome, Silas, Luke, and Barnabas. For the two former there is really no evidence whatever. The use of the Epistle by Clement, in his letter to the Corinthians, proves that it was extant in his time, but makes against, rather than in favor of, the supposition that he was its author. Guericke, Ebrard, and Delitzsch, follow Origen, in referring the substance of it to Paul and the form to Luke. But the hypothesis of such dictation is an unwarranted conjecture, made, apparently, only to save the apostolic dignity of the Epistle. The style of Luke has indeed a general superficial resemblance to that of this work, in that it bears the impress of culture beyond any other New Testament writings, and moves with a certain calm stateliness characteristic of our author; but in all radical resemblances to the style of our Epistle, it is, I think, wholly wanting. And an independent authorship by Luke is certainly out of the question. He was indeed one of those who received the gospel at second hand; but his position in the church lacked the almost apostolical dignity which clearly belongs to our author; and he was not a Jew, which the author of this Epistle certainly was.

Several modern scholars, as Twesten, Ullmann, Wieseler, Conybeare and Howson, follow Tertullian in assigning the Epistle to Barnabas. This is not without some plausible grounds. As a Levite, Barnabas might be specially interested in those priestly aspects of the gospel, which in our Epistle are so prominent; as a Cypriote, he might have stood in some special relations to Alexandria; and his title, *Son of Exhortation*—not "Son of Consolation" (υἱὸς τῆς παρακλήσεως)—might answer to some features, both of sentiment and style, of our Epistle. But nothing that we know of Barnabas warrants our expecting from him any such profound Old Testament researches, or such elaborate graces of style as characterize our Epistle; and from his residence, more or less protracted, at Jerusalem, we might expect clearer references to the temple service than are found in it. Our Epistle connects the Jewish ritual service rather with the Mosaic tabernacle than with the temple, which is not, I think, once expressly named in the Epistle. We may add that if Barnabas was the author of the writings which have come down to us under his name, then the Epistle to the Hebrews cannot be from his pen; and if it *is* from him, it is certainly an extraordinary ordering of Providence that the name of this great leader in the church should be transmitted to later ages in connection with an almost worthless forgery, and almost wholly dissevered from the work which would have placed him among the noblest instructors of the church, and in the very first rank of Biblical authorship.

The only name, I think, connected with the authorship of our Epistle, for which any strong argument can be made, is one wholly unknown in this connection to Christian antiquity—that of Apollos, The first to ascribe the Epistle to him, breaking in on the settled current of Mediæval opinion, was Luther, followed by some of his compeers of the

Reformation. This hypothesis once started has found gradually increasing favor. Clericus and Semler, Bleek, the Coryphœus among the expounders of this Epistle; more recently, Tholuck, Credner, Alford, Lunemann, Kurtz, and among the very latest, W. F. Moulton, have given in their adherence to the view which fixes the authorship upon Apollos. The grounds for a certain conclusion are doubtless wanting; but all the positive evidence tends in this direction. The author of the Epistle was certainly a Jew, and nearly as certainly an extra-Palestinian Jew. He was a person of elegant culture, and trained in the arts of rhetoric: for the Epistle is full of fine rhetorical points. He was apparently acquainted with the writings of the Alexandrian Philo (though untinctured by Philo's allegorizing and mystical tendencies); for the verbal coincidences are too numerous and striking to be the result of accident. He was, therefore, in all probability from Alexandria. He stood as a teacher on high and independent ground, and yet was not of those who had received the gospel at first hand. He differed widely from Paul in his *mode* of presenting the gospel; was a far more finished writer and commanded a more eloquent style, and yet is actuated by the same spirit, and is in all fundamental points in perfect harmony with him. He was profoundly versed in the Old Testament, and had that power of fathoming and drawing out its hidden meanings, which would enable him "with great power to convince the Jews from the Old Testament Scriptures that Jesus is the Christ," as witness his treatment of Ps. 8 : 5–7; of Ps. 109 : 4; 39 : 40, and of the Lord's Melchisedec priesthood. All these requisites to the authorship of this Epistle are fulfilled in Apollos, and we could scarcely find them more significantly summed up than in the words of Acts 18 : 24, 25. "Apollos, a Jew from Alexandria, an eloquent (or lettered) man, mighty in the Scriptures, with great power convincing the Jews from the Old Testament that Jesus is the Christ." Add to this his further training by Aquila and Priscilla, disciples of Paul, his companionship with the apostle himself, and the crowning inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and I doubt if we have much farther to seek for the man through whom the Spirit enriched the church with this precious storehouse of sacred truth.

II. DESTINATION OF THE EPISTLE.

All that is clear in regard to the destination of the Epistle is that it was directed to Hebrew Christians, who had distinguished themselves by their fidelity and Christian beneficence (6 : 10), but had declined from their steadfastness, and had ceased from their Christian progress, and were relapsing into Judaism. That they were Christians in Palestine was generally assumed by antiquity, and might naturally be inferred from there being no mention of an intermixture of Gentile believers. Yet this reason is scarcely decisive, as there may have been in many places Christian bodies preponderantly Hebrew; and assuming Apollos to be the author, it seems scarcely likely that he stood in any such relation to the churches of Palestine as this letter would imply. It would be more natural to find its first readers in Alexandria, a place swarming with Hebrews, and to which the style of thought and diction would seem more fitted than to Palestine. This hypothesis has been adopted by Credner, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, Bunsen, Conybeare and Howson, and others. Yet it lacks positive support; there is no certainty that any Christian churches yet existed in Alexandria, and the entire ignorance of the Alexandrian Fathers regarding its author and history is strongly against it. Stronger reasons, I think, exist for finding, with Alford, Kurtz, and others, its original circle of readers in Rome. This view would explain the early knowledge and use of the Epistle by the Roman Clement, would harmonize with the references (10 : 32–34) to persecutions experienced by the Christians under Nero

in the year 64, and under Domitian in about 74, in which express mention is made (Eusebius' "Hist. Eccles." III. 17) of the confiscation of their goods (10 : 34), and is strongly supported by the language of the closing salutation, "those from Italy (οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας) salute you." Were the language "those of Italy" (οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἰταλίας), "they that belong to Italy," it might naturally be referred to one who was writing from Italy, and was giving to foreigners the salutations of his Italian brethren. But the phrase "those from" Italy (οἱ ἀπὸ), indicates rather Italians absent from Italy, and making his letter the vehicle of their greetings to their countrymen. Or, of course, it might indicate Italian companions of the writer, addressing their greetings to friends in some other region than Italy. Yet of the suppositions the former is the more probable, and it harmonizes with the intrinsic probability that an Epistle of so great importance would be more likely to find its destination in Rome. The question stands open.

III. PLACE AND DATE OF COMPOSITION.

The *place* of composition of the letter lies in still deeper obscurity than its destination, and is indeed of less importance. According to our previous view, it was not written in Italy, and as the place where it was written contained evidently Italian residents, it may, as supposed by Bleek, Kurtz, etc., be some seaport town, as Corinth or Ephesus, easily accessible to fugitives from the Roman persecutions, especially as these towns had been the former scenes of the labors of Apollos.

As to the *time* of composition, there is a very general concurrence among all expositors in the opinion that it was written somewhere between the years 62 and 67. That the Jewish Temple was still standing cannot be inferred from chapter 10, where the present is certainly the *historical present*, and is describing under the present time the arrangements of the Mosaic tabernacle, and therefore has no necessary reference to the temple at Jerusalem. Still, if so great a blow to Judaism as the destruction of the temple had actually been experienced, it seems hardly credible that the Epistle, reticent as it is regarding historical events, should not have given some intimation of it; and it seems, on the whole, safest to fix the date of the Epistle a little before the year 70, when the flames of civil war were reddening the horizon, and giving a fearful significance to the words "and so much the more as ye see the *day* (the *dies iræ*, the day of the great impending catastrophe) approaching." (10 : 25; compare 1 Cor. 3 : 13.)

IV. PURPOSE AND CONTENTS.

The immediate object of the Epistle is to arrest the backsliding of a body of Jewish Christians who, having once distinguished themselves by their Christian activity, beneficence, and constancy under persecutions, were now relapsing into Judaism. To the attainment of this end it proceeds with a singleness and intensity of purpose which contrast strikingly with the placid smoothness of the style. It divides itself in general into a doctrinal or argumentative, and a practical or hortatory part. The argumentative part extends from the beginning to chapter 10 : 19. The practical part extends from chapter 10 : 20 to the end. In the theoretical portions, however, are interspersed hortatory passages of greater or less length, and the hortatory portion is more or less tinged with argument. Yet the general dividing line is clear and unmistakable, and the argument proceeds on a single line of discussion, aiming to show the superiority of the New Covenant to the Old by showing the measureless superiority of Him who was the Introducer, Founder, and

High Priest of the New Covenant to the corresponding classes of personages in the Old. The analysis of the Epistle is as follows:

PART I. ARGUMENTATIVE AND DOCTRINAL.

1. CHRIST SUPERIOR TO THE ANGELS.

Ch. 1. (1) *The manifold and fragmentary forms of Revelation in the Old Covenant have been replaced by one final Revelation in the Son, who, as Mediator of the New Covenant, is exalted as high above the angels* (messengers), *mediators of the Old, as his* name (*Son*) *is more excellent than theirs.* (1 : 1–4.)

(2) *Proof and illustration from the Old Testament of Christ's superiority as Son of God to the angels.* (5–14.)

Ch. 2. (3) *Brief exhortation to heed a revelation made by so extraordinary a personage. By as much as the Son is superior to the angels, by so much greater the peril of disobeying his message than theirs.* (1–4.)

(4) *Christ, though as Son infinitely superior to the angels, yet was humbled temporarily below them, that, suffering and dying as man, he might rescue and elevate his human brethren, and, as a faithful High Priest, reconcile them to God.* (5–18.)

2. CHRIST SUPERIOR TO MOSES.

Ch. 3. (1) *Christ, as Leader of the New Testament Israel and founder of the New Testament house of God, greater than Moses, leader of ancient Israel, and founder of the Old Testament house of God.* (1–6.)

(2) *Solemn warning to the readers against repeating the rebellion of their fathers and excluding themselves from God's Sabbatic rest, as the rebels under Moses forfeited the rest of Canaan.* (7–19.)

Ch. 4. (3) *The rest of God forfeited by ancient Israel, still open under its higher form, as God's Sabbatic rest, to the spiritual Israel.* (1–10.)

(4) *Renewed exhortation in view of the renewed promise of a higher rest, and based on the spiritual and searching qualities of the word; and transition, through their need of a sympathizing high priest, to the next and chief topic of the Epistle.* (11–16.)

3. CHRIST SUPERIOR TO AARON.

Christ, the High Priest of the New Dispensation, superior to Aaron, the high priest of the Old.

Ch. 5. (1) *Necessary qualities of the high priest.* (1–10.)

(*a*) He is taken from among men, that he, as man, may deal tenderly with men. (1–3.)

(*b*) Christ is not self-appointed, but called of God. (4.)

(*c*) Christ received his priestly office from God, (5, 6.)

(*d*) In his fleshly nature *as man*, Christ wrestled with the fear of death, and, learning obedience from suffering, was perfected for his saving and priestly work. (7–10.)

(2) *Long hortatory passage, suggested by the incapacity of the readers to enter on the profound discussion before them; namely, the priesthood of Christ.* (5 : 11–6 : 20.)

(*a*) Failure of the readers in that spiritual maturity which they should, by this time have attained. (11–14.)

Ch. 6. (*b*) To this condition of spiritual maturity just described the writer exhorts his readers to hasten forward, and not linger among the elements of the religious life. He alarms them with the possibility that their backsliding may become irretrievable, but assures them of his better and brighter hope for them. (1–8.)

(*c*) The brighter aspects of the case. The author would encourage as well as alarm. He declares to his readers his confidence that under God's covenant faithfulness better things await them; cites his oath to Abraham as a sure ground of confidence, and, reminding them of their hope which enters the heavenly sanctuary, and rests on the heavenly High Priest, thus brings his subject gracefully round to the starting point in the heavenly high priesthood of Jesus, from which he had digressed. (9–20.)

Ch. 7. (3) *The royal Melchisedec priesthood of Christ.* (1–28.)

(*a*) Summary of the Old Testament description of Melchisedec in those historical features which determine the character of his priesthood. (1–3.)

(*b*) Personal greatness of Melchisedec illustrated by his receiving tithes from Abraham, and that under extraordinary conditions. (4–10.)

(*c*) Application of these facts in regard to Melchisedec to the subject. The introduction of a new priesthood implies the failure of the Levitical, and the abrogation of the law for which it stood responsible. (11, 12.)

(*d*) This change in the law shown historically in the change of tribe to which the priest belongs. (13, 14.)

(*e*) The change is shown more clearly in the *intrinsic character* of the new priesthood, which is constituted not after a carnal ritual, but after the power of an endless life. (15–19.)

(*f*) A further proof of the superiority of the Melchisedec priesthood, is that it is instituted with the sanction of an oath. (20–22.)

(*g*) Christ's Melchisedec priesthood, unlike the Levitical succession, is a single, perpetual, everlasting priesthood, which can thus carry through to completeness its work of salvation. (23–25.)

(*h*) Exultant summing up of the qualities of Christ's Melchisedec priesthood necessary to be allied with those of the Aaronical high priest, to which topic ver. 26–28 form a transition. (26–28.)

Ch. 8. (4) *The efficient Aaronical high priesthood of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary.* (8 : 1–10 : 18.)

(*a*) As a royal Melchisedec Priest, Christ has taken his seat at the right hand of God, and as Levitical High Priest, he has gone into the heavenly tabernacle. (1, 2.)

(*b*) As such a High Priest, Christ must of necessity have something to offer. (3.)

(*c*) So vitally connected are these two, the priesthood and the offering, that *on earth* there would be no place for his priesthood, as there exist already there those who make the offerings of the law, and whose prerogatives are inviolate. (4.)

(*d*) But, in fact, he *is* a High Priest, and can, therefore, make offerings, because he has the true tabernacle and the true priesthood, of which theirs were but a shadow, and a priesthood as much better than theirs as is the covenant, of which he is the Mediator, better than theirs. (5, 6.)

(*e*) For that it *is* better than the first (this subordinately and in passing) is clear from its having superseded it. For God, having found the first inefficacious, replaces it by a new, and the former one becomes antiquated and expires. (7–13.)

Ch. 9. (*f*) But that First Covenant (for to see how the New is organized, we must look back to that, its copy; and to see what the new High Priest must offer, we must look back and see what the old one offered) had its ordinances of service, and its sanctuary consisting of two tabernacles, an outer or more common, and an inner and holier one. (9 : 1–6.)

(*g*) Now in the outer sanctuary the priests performed constant ministrations, but into

this inner sanctuary the hight priest went alone once a year, *not without blood*—he carried in there the blood of slaughtered victims, symbolically, though not really expiatory of sin. (6–10.)

(*h*) We see, then, what is demanded of our High Priest. It is *blood*. And as his is the true, and not the symbolical priesthood, as he is in the genuine, and not the copied sanctuary, he must offer blood that is really, and not symbolically, cleansing. He brings *his own*. (11–14.)

(*i*) This spiritual efficacy of the blood of Christ warrants and demands a New Covenant, inaugurated, like the First, with blood, but the blood of a nobler victim than that of the Old; for Christ has entered into the true antitypical sanctuary, not, like the earthly high priests, for repeated entrances, but once for all, never to leave it until he comes without sin unto salvation. (15–28.)

Ch. 10. (5) *Summing up of the entire high priestly argument.* (10 : 1–18.)

(*a*) Finality of Christ's voluntary *sacrifice* as opposed to the symbolical sacrifices of the law. (1–10.)

(*b*) Finality of Christ's priestly ministration as opposed to the oft-repeated ministrations of the Levitical priesthood. (11–14.)

(*c*) Finality of the New Covenant, and of the sacrifice which seals it as effecting the absolute remission of sins. (15–18.)

PART II. HORTATORY.

(*a*) Exhortation to approach God boldly, to stir up each other to love, and not to forsake the Christian assemblies. (19–25.)

(*b*) The exhortation sharpened by the terrible consequences of apostasy. (26–31.)

(*c*) Encouragement from past fidelity, and exhortation not to throw away its fruits. (32–39.)

Ch. 11. (2) *Encouraging survey of the achievements of faith in Jewish history. Muster roll of the heroes of faith.* (1–40.)

(*a*) Illustrations of faith in the antediluvian believers. (1–7.)

(*b*) Example of Abraham and Sarah. (8–12.)

(*c*) Retrospective glance at the above-cited believers. (13–16.)

(*d*) Examples of the Jewish patriarchs. (17–22.)

(*e*) Example of Moses. (23–29.)

(*f*) Examples from the Exodus of Israel to the time of the Maccabees. (30–40.)

Ch. 12. (3) *Renewed exhortations, suggested chiefly by this historical survey.* (12 : 1–29.)

(*a*) Incitement to endurance from the encompassing presence of this host of witnesses, and especially of Jesus, their Leader. (1–3.)

(*b*) Their afflictions the fruits of God's chastening love. (4–11.)

(*c*) They are to resist firmly all relaxing tendencies by cultivating unity, purity, and constant watchfulness. (12–17.)

(*d*) They are to hearken to these exhortations in view of the grandeur and exalted character of the New Covenant, and the danger of disregarding its blessings and claims. (18–29.)

CONCLUSION.

Ch. 13. (1) *Practical admonitions of a general character.* (1–9.)

(2) *Renewed exhortations against apostasy.* (10–21.)

(3) *Final injunctions, personal references, and salutations.* (22–25.)

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

CHAPTER I.

GOD, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets,
2 Hath in these last days spoken unto us by *his* Son,

1 God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers
2 manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto

PART I.

1. CHRIST SUPERIOR TO THE ANGELS.

Ch. 1. (1) *The manifold and fragmentary forms of Revelation in the Old Covenant have been replaced by one final Revelation in the Son, who, as Mediator of the New Covenant, is exalted as high above the angels* (messengers), *mediators of the Old, as his* name (*Son*) *is more excellent than theirs.* (1 : 1-4.)

1. At sundry times and in divers manners. The full sounding words of the original (πολυμερῶς, *in many parts*, and πολυτρόπως, *in many ways*) open with sonorous assonance the majestic sentence. The former, not 'at sundry times' (which in itself might show the *privileged* character of the Old Dispensation), but *in many parts, by piecemeal, fragmentarily* (μείρω, *divide*; μέρος, *a part*); the ancient revelation being made, not in one complete whole, but gradually and in fragments, as by Moses, Joshua, David, Isaiah, Malachi, etc., each in his own separate way helping to complete the slowly developed system. The 'various ways,' or *modes*, are by promise and vision, as to Abraham: by the giving of the Law and the instituting of symbolical expiations through Moses; by lyrical song through David; by oral and symbolical prediction through Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Malachi, etc. The two terms together denote the whole variety of promises, predictions, and symbols by which the divine plan was gradually unfolded under the Old Covenant, as against the one complete revelation made through the Son under the New. **Spake**—*having spoken.*[1] The verb (λαλέω) in the classics, ordinarily *to talk, prattle*, is used in the New Testament habitually of dignified speaking. **Unto the fathers**—the whole body of the ancient Jewish people, as a term of affectionate reverence. **By** (*in*) **the prophets.** "In"—either Hebraistic for *by*, as instrumental, or better, strictly *in*, as denoting the *sphere* of God's speaking. He was *in* the prophets and *in* the Son; and as being *in*, spoke *through* them. (So De Wette, Lange, Lünemann, Delitzsch.) **Prophets**—not here prophets in the narrower sense, as Samuel, Isaiah, etc., but all the great men who in various ways were organs of the divine communications, as Abraham, Moses, David, Isaiah. So a prophet is not merely, perhaps not properly, a *fore*-speaker, but a *forth*-speaker, an utterer of God's thoughts.

2. In these last days, or, *at the close of these days.* 'These days.' Looking down the vista of the future, the Jewish prophets saw the then present period ('these days') bounded and succeeded by the age of the Messiah. 'These days,' therefore, as "this age" (ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος), became a sort of *terminus technicus* for the ante-Messianic period, and "the coming age" for the Messianic time which was to succeed it. Jewish prophecy, indeed, drew no clear dividing line between the first and second comings of the Anointed One. The actual unfolding of events broke this period into two portions—that which preceded and that which followed the Second Coming. The time between the First and the Second Coming became a sort of intermediate period, a transient interval before the great drama of eternity was fully inaugurated. Christians during this period were living in "the last time"; but they were already substantially in "the coming age," and had "tasted the powers of the coming age" (6: 5), and it was at the introduction of this first section, at the "interlocking of the ages" (συντελεία τῶν αἰώνων, 9 : 26) that Christ had appeared. **Hath spoken unto us**—literally,

[1] λαλήσας, predicate participle, not *who spoke*, ὁ λαλήσας. The aorist participle is never in itself exactly equivalent to the perfect. But the Greek is fond of the aorist form, and especially prefers the aorist participle to the more cumbrous perfect (compare λαλήσας and λελαληκώς), and the difference in meaning is often not material.

whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;
3 Who being the brightness of *his* glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things

us in [1] *his* Son, whom he appointed heir of all things.
3 through whom also he made the [2] worlds; who being the effulgence of his glory, and [3] the very image of his substance, and upholding all things by the word

1 Gr. *a Son*.....2 Gr. *ages*.....3 Or, *the impress of his substance.*

spoke; but the perfect here is more idiomatic English. The verb points back to the time of the historic act. Observe that God is the common subject alike of the participle ("having spoken") and the verb ("hath spoken"). Of both Dispensations God is the author. He instituted the first, and when its purpose was fulfilled he removed it that he might establish the second. **By** (*in*) **his Son**—*in* one who was *Son.* In the original the article is omitted to emphasize, not the individual, but the *character*—in him who bears the character of *Son.* The term here refers, I think, to the historic Son of God—to that theanthropic personage, who, of both human and divine parentage, was at once "Son of Man" and "Son of God." See Luke 1 : 35; Matt. 3 : 17; 16 : 16; John 17 : 1. That Christ's Sonship involves essential equality with God is certain. The relation is grounded in his essential and eternal nature; but more commonly, in Scripture the term designates his historic manifestation. Scripture certainly does not lift the veil from the *mode* of Christ's prehistoric existence; its utmost reach of unveiling is "the glory which I had with thee before the world was." Perhaps the mystery, like that of the divine nature itself, could not be made intelligible in human language, or to the finite understanding. **Whom he hath appointed**—*placed, appointed, constituted.* (So often in the classics, as Herodian, "Hist." 5 : 7, 10; Xenophon "Cyropædia," 4 : 6, 3; Ælian, "Variæ Historiæ" 13 : 6.) This refers not to an appointment in God's eternal purpose and counsel (as Bleek, Bengel, Lünemann), but to his historical exaltation after his resurrection. (Tholuck, Ebrard, De Wette, Delitzsch, Moll.) The thought is thoroughly Scriptural. Christ's supreme authority, purposed in the eternal counsels, promised before his incarnation (Matt. 26 : 64; 28 : 18), bestowed at his ascension, which he retains until the Second Coming, when it is enhanced in glory, while restricted in sphere (1 Cor. 15 : 28), is here denoted. The term **heir** (*inheritor*) **of all things** is selected with reference to his *Sonship.* The Son inherits his Father's dominion, which is *universal* (all things). **By** (*through*) **whom** (δι οὗ). Christ, while essentially equal, appears subordinate in his working, to the Father. **He also made** (or, *had made*) **the worlds,** and might therefore properly appoint him Ruler. The present clause steps back to find in the Son's pre-incarnate relation to the universe a fitting reason for his being now appointed its Lord.[1] **Worlds** (αἰῶνας), properly *ages;* hence worlds as existing in time, as kosmos (κόσμος) is world existing in space.

3. Who (the pre-incarnate Son) **being** from eternity as the eternal Logos, or Word, who was originally with God (John 1 : 1): **the brightness**—better, *the effulgence,* raying forth, radiance (ἀπαύγασμα), a rare Philonian word, more elevated than *brightness* (λαμπρότης). It is not the abstract action of shining forth (ἀπαύγασις), but the *concrete result* of the process, the radiant and abiding *image* or reflection of the divine glory, implying at once *derivation, essential likeness, and independent existence.*[2] The word is no Pauline word—found only here in the New Testament. But the thought is a Pauline thought, for which Paul uses *image* (εἰκών), and *form* (μορφή). Compare Col. 1 : 15; Phil. 2 : 6. **And the express image of his person,** or, *substance.* 'Express image.' The Greek word rendered express image (χαρακτήρ, from χαράσσω, *sharpen, make pointed, scratch, grave*) is, properly, the person or instrument that graves, the engraver; then the *figure cut in, the stamp, the impress* answering to the die that stamps it. Thus, under a different figure, the thought is essentially the same as above. There the glory of the Deity is a permanent raying forth, *effulgent image;* here it is the divine

[1] καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας is, therefore, a more appropriate as well as better attested reading than the καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν, which throws the emphasis on αἰῶνας.

[2] So Wisdom of Solomon 7 : 26, where it is explained by ἔσοπτρον, *mirror,* and εἰκών, *image;* Philo "de Concupisc. Mang." p. 357, § 11; "De Opif. Mundi," M. p. 35, 1 (τῆς μακαριας φὐσεως ἐκμαγεῖον ἢ ἀπόσπασμα, ἢ ἀπαύγασμα, *an impress, or effulgence of the Blessed Nature*); "De Plantat. Noe." M. 1, 337, where it is equivalent to μίμημα and εἰκών, *the embodied imitation and image.*

by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;
4 Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.

of his power, when he had made purification of sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on
4 high; having become by so much better than the angels, as he hath inherited a more excellent name

essence stamped upon the Son.[1] 'Substance' (ὑπόστασις, *a standing under, substantia*). The original word denotes, hence: (1) foundation, origin; (2) substance, essence; (3) ground of trust, boldness, confidence—in the New Testament, in signification (3) in Heb. 3:14; 11:1; 2 Cor. 9:4. In signification (2) only here; namely, *substance, essential being.* In the sense of *person* (persona) as marking the divine tripersonality, it belongs to later ecclesiastical writers, not to the New Testament. **Upholding** (φέρων, *bearing*), partly passively, *sustaining;* partly actively, *carrying forward, administering*, **all things**—that is, the universe. **By,** or, *with*, **the word,** the utterance or mandate (ῥήματι, not λόγῳ), **of his power**—the utterance in which his power is put forth; more forcible than "by his powerful word." The words express the absolute ease with which the Son effects his work: he *speaks*, and it is done. The same word, or utterance, which called into existence the universe, sustains and administers it. **When he had by himself purged our sins**—better, *After making a cleansing of sins.* A brief expression for making an expiatory sacrifice, which ensured the cleansing; and, again, the cleansing of sins is equivalent to the cleansing of persons from their sins. The author, at this early stage, introduces Christ's high-priestly character; the middle participle (meaning, *making for himself*) shows how closely the sacrificial act belonged to the Son. With the commencement of this verse the thought had receded from the Son's historic manifestation to his pre-incarnate and eternal relation; the last clause has stepped forward again to the historical sphere. **Sat down,** or, *Took his seat.* See Ps. 110:1. The original idea was that of *protection from an enemy* (Rev. 12:5), rather than of honor and sovereignty. Yet it came to imply this, as Matt. 26:64, "sitting at the right hand of power." The sitting marks calmness and repose; the "standing," of Acts 7:55, marks activity and protection. **At the right hand of Majesty.** 'Majesty' for the Majestic One (the abstract for the concrete), as at Matt 26:64, 'Power' (τῆσ δυνάμεως) for the Powerful One. **On high** (literally, *In the lofty heavens*) belongs to *took his seat* ("took his seat in the lofty heavens;" heavens is understood, as at Luke 2:14, "glory to God in the highest heavens"). This connection is shown in the original by the absence of the article (τῆς) before the lofty heavens (ἐν τοις ὑψηλοῖς).[2]

4. *Becoming,* not, **being made,** as in the Common Version, nor "having become," as in the Revised Version. The meaning is, that in thus taking his seat, he *became*, etc.[3] **So much better**—that is, *mightier*, superior in position and authority. **Than the angels.** Introduced here with reference to the name *messengers*, which was derived from their function. We scarcely need say that the language implies no enhancement of the Son's intrinsic excellence, power, or dignity; but only a display or exercise of them corresponding to his nature, and to the work which he had wrought in the great redemptive system. **As he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.** He has received by inheritance as Son; the verb is adapted to the relation; 'a more excellent name,' a name transcending, surpassing theirs. Their name is *messenger; his* name is *Son.* 'Name' is here equivalent to *title.* His proper earthly name was "Jesus"; the name of his divine relation was "Son," which was gloriously confirmed when, by his resurrection and ascension, he was constituted "Son of God with power." See Rom. 1:4. The name, or title, conferred upon him in his exaltation, and to which answers the "becom-

[1] Χαρακτήρ in the New Testament only here. Compare Philo "De Plantat. Noe." M. 1, p. 332, where the rational soul is stamped with the seal of God, whose impress (χαρακτήρ) is the eternal Word (ἀίδιος λόγος).

[2] 'The Majesty on high' would require τῆς Μεγαλότητος τῆς ἐν τοῖς ὑψηλοῖς. There are many cases in the New Testament in which the absence of the article indicates a different construction from that of the Common Version. Rom. 8:2, "in Christ Jesus" belongs to "made me free" (ἠλευθέρωσεν).

[3] The aorist participle here, as not unfrequently elsewhere, though not commonly, is complementary. See John 1:14. The word *became*, not, *was made.*

5 For unto which of the angels said he at any time,
Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And
again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me
a Son?

5 than they. For unto which of the angels said he at
any time,
Thou art my Son,
This day have I begotten thee?
and again,
I will be to him a Father,
And he shall be to me a Son?

ing so much mightier" of our passage. The name above every name, of Phil. 2 : 9–11, was "Lord." [1]

(2) *Proof and illustration from the Old Testament of Christ's superiority as Son of God to the angels.* (5–14.)

5. Unto which of the angels said he at any time. An emphatic form of denial equivalent to "unto none," and involving an emphatic inferential affirmation that he *did* say it to another. **Thou art my Son.** Taken from Ps. 2 : 7—one of the most remarkable of the Psalms, and always regarded as either directly or indirectly (at all events, ultimately) Messianic. It points to no event in the Messiah's history so naturally as to its closing scene, his crucifixion, resurrection, and glorification. This suits the tenor of the Psalm, with its banded foes, leagued against Jehovah and his anointed; their baffled rage, and the Son, the more immediate object of the insurrection, seated in triumph above their fury on the holy hill of Zion. It evidently refers to the same scene, whether real or ideal, typical or historical, as Ps. 110 : 1: "*Jehovah* said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." The scene of the Psalm is certainly not applicable to the incarnation, but fits perfectly to the crucifixion and ascension. So the New Testament applies it (Acts 4 : 25-28; 13 : 33) where there is no hesitation in referring our passage to the death and resurrection of Jesus. To understand the full force of the "my Son" in such a connection, we may look at the next citation, **I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son.** This is from 2 Sam. 7 : 14, where the connection shows that, though uttered apparently of Solomon, it in reality applied to the great descendant of David, of whom David himself, and Solomon, and their successors, are severally types, and without whom to close and crown the succession, the royal line of Judah was "as a body without a head." The purport of the promise is shown in the angel's announcement to Mary (Luke 1 : 32, 33): "He shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father, David; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." The promise, then, of 2 Sam. 7 : 14 belonged to all the descendants of David in their theocratic and typical character. It belonged to them as representing the Messiah, and was true of them in a sense which applied to no other, either man or angel. The throne itself was invested with a new dignity and sacredness: around every successive prince gathered the Messianic hopes of the nation. Each new investiture, with its prerogatives, inspired fresh expectations; each successive prince *might* be the expected deliverer; each coronation, each marriage, each martial achievement, stood connected with these national hopes, and might call forth from Judah's minstrel some strain of prediction which *he* hoped would find fulfillment in the present prince, but whose realization the inspiring Spirit reserved to a far-distant day. Sometimes the song would pass beyond the prompting occasion to an ideal future, and sometimes, without special immediate occasion, it sprang immediately forward to the glories of the Messianic era. Thus strains immediately and exclusively Messianic, and strains secondarily and typically so, would mingle themselves in the Hebrew minstrelsy. It is most interesting to see how the great promise—at first attached generally to the seed of the woman, then narrowed to the line of Abraham—had now, under this prediction of Nathan, become centered in the line of David, from whose descendants, even after the royalty of Judah was smitten to the dust, it was unwaveringly believed that the Promised One would appear.

Returning to our first citation from the Second Psalm, we see how the author of our Epistle could find in it a Messianic significance. Who was its author and what its

[1] Διαφορώτερον παρ αὐτούς. The Greek construction involves a double comparative: "More excellent in comparison with or beyond them." The simple construction would be, διαφορώτερον τοῦ ἐκείνων (or αὐτῶν.)

6 And again, when he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.

6 [1] And when he again [2] bringeth the firstborn into [3] the world he saith, And let all the angels of God 7 worship him. And of the angels he saith,

1 Or, *And again when he bringeth in*... ..2 Or, *shall have brought in*.....3 Gr. *the inhabited earth.*

immediate occasion we do not know. It may have sprung from some historical scene in Jewish history, or it may have been, as it most probably was, primarily and directly Messianic. Its author may have been David; but I think the lofty tone of its sentiment, and the majestic "thunder roll" of its style, gives probability to Delitzsch's conjecture, which attributes its authorship to the evangelical prophet, Isaiah. In any case, the scene of the dramatic lyric, whether primarily or typically Messianic, can, as Messianic, be laid only in the time of his ascension. At his birth was no such combined uprising of his and God's enemies; at his Second Coming all his foes have been long since put under his feet. The New Testament actually applies it to this period. Hence, in "*to-day have I begotten thee*," "to-day" is not the 'to-day' of eternity; the begetting is not spoken of the Son's eternal generation, or of his essential and eternal filial relation to the Father; but of that exaltation of Jesus at God's right hand, and investing of him with universal sovereignty, which Paul calls (Rom. 1:4) "constituting him Son of God in power." In his resurrection and ascension (they are virtually one), the rage and hopes of his enemies had been baffled, and his utmost pretensions to divine Sonship had been completely vindicated. He came into earth the "Son of man"; he re-ascended to heaven the declared Son of God.

But his superiority to the angels is to be further vindicated. In his incarnate life his glory was veiled, and he appears lower than the angels. Their ministry to him looks like a ministry of compassion, rather than of service. And now his exaltation above them, though real and transcendent, is outside the sphere of his humiliation, and beyond the limits of the inhabited universe. He is to come again in circumstances which will display the relative position of Son and angels within our visible heavens, and in the sphere of his former humiliation. The author, therefore, adds:

6. And again, when he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world, etc.; we may render, *And when he shall conduct back again into the inhabited world the firstborn, he saith* (proleptic for *he will say*), **And let all the angels of God worship him.** This verse completes the picture of Christ's exaltation by pointing forward to the glory of his Second Coming, when his superiority to the angels will be signally displayed; and forms a latent contrast to the humiliation of his first appearance. His first coming was in lowliness, and placed him below the angels. His resurrection and ascension exalted him, indeed, to transcendent glory, but it was extra-mundane, and had no earthly witnesses. His next coming, the author exultingly adds, in answer to the lurking objection drawn from that former humiliation, will be after a different fashion. It will be with a retinue of adoring angels, who will hasten to anticipate the decree, 'And let all the angels of God worship him.' It has been objected that if this verse be understood of Christ's Second Coming, there must have immediately preceded a reference to his first entrance, or incarnation. But of this there is no necessity. The first coming was of so recent occurrence that it may well be assumed to have been in every one's mind, as the lurking background to the present contrast. The passage admits no other reference, and in this connection is strikingly pertinent. As to the words, the position of 'again' (πάλιν) is unfortunate in the Common Version, making the clause appear a second quotation ("And again, when he bringeth in," etc.), thus throwing great obscurity over the passage and making its reference utterly uncertain, so that Prof. Stuart and others would have had excuse for supposing it to refer to some unnamed event in Hebrew history. But the original leaves no ground of doubt; the 'again' belongs to the verb, and points to a second introduction, a *bringing back* of the Son into a realm he had formerly visited. The verb "conduct into," "introduce" (εἰσάγειν) refers probably to God's introducing the Son into the *inheritance* that had been settled upon him, and to which he is *brought back*, his enemies subdued, to take formal possession. The term

7 And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire.

Who maketh his angels winds,
And his ministers a flame of fire:

'firstbegotten' (or *firstborn*, πρωτότοκον) is an elegant periphrasis for Son, but used with special appropriateness to his present historical relation. As the Father's eternal Son, dwelling in his bosom (John 1:18), he was the "only begotten" (μονογενής); as the firstborn from the dead, the "first fruits of them that sleep"; the "firstborn among many brethren" (Rom. 8:29), he was the *firstborn*, the term implying heirship of all things, and preeminence over the whole creation. (Col. 1:15.) He descended from heaven as the only begotten of the Father, he reascended to it as the firstborn, installed, in the world of redemption, chief of the creation of God. *The world* (οἰκουμένη, *inhabited* earth or region) has probably special reference here to the inhabited portion of the universe in contrast with that extra-mundane realm into which he passed when he ascended "above all heavens" to the right hand of God. His return, led back by the Father, with a retinue of worshiping angels, will be to our inhabited world. The citation, 'And let all the angels of God worship him,' is either from Ps. 97:7, "And let all his angels worship him" (so the Septuagint; Hebrew, "Worship him all ye Gods"); or from the song of Moses (Deut. 32:43), where we have in the Vatican text of the Septuagint, and in that copy of the song which is found affixed to the Psalter in the Codex Alexandrinus, the one generally employed by our author, the precise language of our passage, "Rejoice, ye nations, with him, and let all the angels of God worship him." From this the citation is probably taken, the Septuagint translators having doubtless found the words in their copy of the Hebrew text, although they have disappeared from ours.

There may seem a difficulty in the application of this passage to Christ, inasmuch as the song of Moses has no declared reference to the times of the Messiah. But Moses himself was a type of Christ. As a prophet, he wrote and spoke of him (Luke 24:27; John 5:46), and in such passages as this song contains would such references be naturally found. In the early part of the song, Moses speaks of the corruption and apostasy of the people of God, then of their punishment and restoration, when God "will repent himself for his servants," and visit judgment on these enemies. And in view of this he calls on the heavens to rejoice, and the angels of God to worship him. But who is to do all this but he who shall sit on David's throne and give to his royal line its everlasting succession? And when shall this be, but when he comes in the consummated majesty of his kingdom? Rightly, therefore, has our author judged the purpose of the inspiring Spirit in finding this application of the passage; and looking at the whole scope of the Old Testament no other interpretation is legitimate. Unless such intimations of the Messiah are found flashing out along the Old Testament pages, both the Old Testament and the New become an unsolvable enigma. One further remark against the applying of this passage to the time of the incarnation. The angels did indeed then worship the lowly Messiah, always and everywhere, as an infant, as transfigured, on the cross. But it was no time to *challenge* their worship of him. His place, his work, was one of humiliation, and their manifested worship was occasional and sporadic. They doubtless met him behind the cloud which bore him back from earth, with all the blazing chivalry of heaven; and with even yet more resplendent pomp they will usher him back when God, his Father, conducts him back into his predestined inheritance.

7. Continued illustration of the difference of the two parties, drawn from their respective names. **And of** (that is, *in respect, indeed, to*) **the angels** (*messengers*) **he saith**—that is, God saith in the Scripture, the utterances of Scripture being the utterances of God—**Who maketh his angels spirits,** etc.; or, *his messengers winds*, not 'spirits,' as in the Common Version, and even in the margin of the Revised Version, but which is here totally out of place. The angels are brought down, by virtue of their name, to a level with the agencies of nature. It would be no disparagement of them to call them 'spirits.' **And his ministers a flame of fire.** The citation is from Ps. 104:4, after the Septuagint, except that the Codex Vaticanus (and probably, originally, also the Codex Alexandrinus; the other reading being apparently a correction from our Epistle) has "flaming fire" (πῦρ φλέγον), instead of a "flame

8 But unto the Son *he saith*, Thy throne, O God, *is* for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness *is* the sceptre of thy kingdom.

8 but of the Son *he saith*,
Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever;
And the sceptre of uprightness is the sceptre of
[1] thy kingdom.

1 The two oldest Greek manuscripts read *his*.

of fire." The Common Version of the Psalm reads, "who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire." The Hebrew original reads most naturally, according to the scope of the context, "who maketh winds his messengers, and flaming fire (equivalent to *lightning*) his ministers." But the double accusative allows the construction, "who maketh his messengers winds, and his ministers flaming fire," which is the rendering of the Septuagint, only that by placing the article before "messengers" and "ministers" it shows that it regards them as angels. This rendering is adopted by our author as precisely fitting his purpose, who also writes "flaming fire" for a "flame of fire" (perhaps with reference to Exod. 3:2). Delitzsch claims, on grammatical grounds, that the Septuagint rendering is the only right one, and appeals to the Hebrew conception, which informed all things with life, as likely to mingle the mention of angels with that of inanimate agencies. One might either conceive these elemental powers, as, at the breath of God, quickened into living agents to do his will, or the living intelligencies before his throne, drawing on a vesture of wind or fire, resolving themselves into apparent elemental forces, and flying off at the divine mandate to execute his purposes. Not improbably the author conceived the law-giving of Sinai (2:2) as thus accomplished by God's descending on the mount in storm and lightning, which may have disguised the ministry of angels. Under any rendering the passage fits our author's purpose, which is to draw from the angelic name of messenger the mark of their inferiority, as they share the name with inanimate agencies. Two properties in the angels are probably emphasized—their subordinate and ministerial position, and their changeableness, as exchanging their properties with the elements of nature. The word 'ministers' (λειτουργοί) is not the familiar and lower Greek word for "servant" (as διάκονος, δοῦλος), but the word used in the classics for one who renders unrequited service (whether voluntary or involuntary) in the state, and then, in general, marks free and unselfish service. In the Septuagint it is the standing expression for priestly service, and so in our Epistle. The ministry of the angels here conceived, would be rendered in the great temple of the universe. They are a leading part of the grand system of agencies by which God carries forward the administration of the world.

8. But[1] (he saith) **of** (or, *in respect to*) **the Son.** (Not 'unto,' as in the Common Version, but *of*, *in respect of*, which the Greek preposition admits equally well (Luke 12:41; 20:19; Rom. 10:21), and so here the rendering should follow that of ver. 7). He saith here, as above, in Scripture: whether *to* the Son, or *of* him, it is not given as the *direct* utterance of God; but, given as of equal weight with that direct utterance, it is the author's attestation to the divinity of the Scriptures. (The correlatives, —μέν, δέ—often used with classical elegance in this Epistle, imply that the first idea is introduced to prepare the way for, and as a sort of foil to, the second, to which it is subordinate. Thus, "Of the angels indeed" (= while of the *angels*) he uses such language, of the *Son* he employs the following:[1] **Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.** The passage is from Ps. 45, apparently an epithalamium, or marriage song, perhaps on the marriage of Solomon with the daughter of Pharaoh; or, rather (as Delitzsch), of Joram with Athalia, sprung, on the mother's side, from the royal family of Tyre. The minstrel, in his congratulatory strain, addresses in the first part of the Psalm (ver. 7, 8), the bridegroom; in the

1 The concessive, μέν, conceding, but never emphatically affirming (except when used in certain cases for μήν), has generally for its correlative δέ, and the two answer to our *indeed, to be sure, but*, as σοφὸς μέν, κακὸς δέ, *wise indeed, but wicked; θέλει μέν, οὐ ποιεῖ δέ, he wills indeed, to be sure, but does not do.* In the New Testament its force is often disguised by omission or false translation, and in our Epistle it is rendered by *verily, truly*, implying an *emphasis*, which it never has. The peculiarity of the particle consists in its *lightness*, which often makes it too delicate to be expressed in English, except by intonation.

9 Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, *even* thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

9 Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity;
Therefore [1] God, thy God, hath anointed thee
With the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

1 Or, *O God.*

latter part, the bride. The Psalm, however, is essentially Messianic, as the poet addresses to the royal bridegroom language that would be intolerably extravagant, except on the assumption that in him were to be realized the Messianic hopes of the nation. Whether the Psalm was originally suggested by some splendid marriage scene, in which the hope of the people regarding the great promise blazed forth enthusiastically, or, which is not improbable, was originally intended as an ideal picture of the future Deliverer in his mystical espousal of the church, in either case it was Messianic—in the latter case, primarily; in the former, secondarily so. Or, rather, in the one case it terminated but indirectly, in the other directly, on that Prince of the house of David, whose reign was to absorb and crown the glories of all preceding reigns. If an actual marriage festival called forth the exulting strain, it might easily kindle the hope that now was come the fulfillment of the promise. If it did not come now, the language did not fall to the ground; but as dealing with a typical line, every member of which stood in provisional and representative relation to the Messiah, it only passed over, and received from the unfoldings of history its full import and final application. If it be objected that this is creating a hypothesis to meet the facts, I answer that it is the principle which generally controls the prophetic utterances and divine promises of Scripture. In nearly all cases, the recipient of the promise, or the human utterer of the prediction, was mistaken, or at a loss in regard to the time. Prophets made it a subject of study (1 Peter 1:11), and apostles, under the clearer light of the New Testament, were not allowed to measure the limits of the future. The Son himself, as a human Seer, knew not the precise day or hour of his Second Coming.

Messianic, however, either directly or indirectly, this Psalm certainly was; and so was interpreted by the rabbis, and as such held its place in the temple worship. Apart from this, its language is impious or unmeaning; for only to the Messiah, under God, could its epithets be addressed. As Messianic, too, says Delitzsch, it was referred to by the prophets after Jehoshaphat. Isaiah combines the 'mighty,' of ver. 4, and the 'Elohim,' of ver. 6, in the 'mighty God,' descriptive of the Anointed One in Isa. 9:6; and at 61:3 makes the "servant of Jehovah" bestow the "oil of gladness" (ver. 7) for mourning; and Zech. 12:8 declares that "the house of David shall be as God, as the angel of the Lord."

The passage is quoted from the Septuagint. The original admits either rendering: "Thy throne is a throne of God" (that is, a divine throne) for ever and ever; or, "Thy throne of God" (that is, thy divine throne) is for ever and ever; or, 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.' The latter Delitzsch declares to be perfectly admissible, and Hengstenberg to be the only one admissible, and sustained by all the early versions. The passage brings out the transcendently exalted nature of the Messiah, as against the servile relation of the angels, and his immutable and eternal being, as against their changeableness.

A sceptre of righteousness (Greek, "the sceptre of rectitude," εὐθύτης, *straightness, rightness, uprightness;* not 'righteousness' (δικαιοσύνη). The word is found only here in the New Testament, but repeatedly in the Septuagint. See Ps. 9:8; 67:4, etc. Equity, rectitude was to be the characteristic of the Messiah's kingdom, which might be partially, though never perfectly, exhibited by his theocratic representative.

9. Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity. The Hebrew original is rendered in the Common Version "lovest" and "hatest." The Septuagint gave "didst love" and "didst hate," which is adopted by our author, but to which "hast loved" and "hast hated" sufficiently correspond. In the writer's conception, the time is the Messiah's earthly life. "Iniquity" (ἀνομίαν, *lawlessness*) is the reading of the Codex Vaticanus and most lesser MSS; the Sinaitic and Alexandrian Codices read "unrighteousness" (ἀδικίαν). **Therefore God . . . thy God.** So also the Revised Version. But many scholars

10 And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands.

10 And,
Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth,
And the heavens are the works of thy hands:

prefer to render, as certainly the Greek original allows, "therefore, O God, thy God hath anointed thee," etc., which seems to me the most natural construction, the "O God" (ὁ θεός) corresponding to the same word in ver. 8, and the two identical words, in their twofold application, being brought into forcible juxtaposition. We certainly need not shrink, in either passage, from rendering "O God" on account of the thought. The author of our Epistle certainly takes the Psalm as essentially, probably as immediately Messianic, and thus as ascribing to the Anointed One the attributes of Deity. **Hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness.** Many good interpreters (as Bleek, Ebrard, Alford, Lünemann), understand this as the figurative anointing of Jesus, after his accomplished earthly career, as Heavenly King, and thus, of his exaltation above the angels; others (as Moll, Kurtz), laying the stress chiefly on the gladness, sink the figure of the anointing, and make it denote simply the pouring out upon him of an overwhelming fullness of blessing. The expression, 'oil of gladness' (or, *exultation, rejoicing;* the original word is stronger than the customary Greek word for joy or gladness), seems to me decidedly to favor the latter interpretation. **Above thy fellows.** Who are these 'fellows' (μέτοχοι), *sharers, participators?* With Bleek, Lünemann, etc., *angels* — but angels were never *fellows* of Christ, either in his pre-existent, or incarnate, or post-incarnate condition; with Bengel, *all men*, as partakers of his flesh and blood, sharers of his humanity; with Delitzsch, Ebrard, Moll, *kings and princes* in general, with whom Christ shares the kingly office, while exalted immeasurably above them. "I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth." (Ps. 89 : 27.) "The first-begotten of the dead, and the Prince of the kings of the earth." (Rev. 1 : 5.) Others, still, make them *Christians*, Christ's human brethren, sharers at once of his human nature, and of his heavenly anointing and divine Sonship; he, as firstborn among many brethren, being preeminent among them. The reference of the Hebrew bard would seem, most naturally, to be to the monarch's *fellow* princes. Perhaps our author's conception did not trace it minutely —he is simply quoting; yet chapter 2 might warrant our transferring the 'fellows' to his Christian brethren.

10. And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth. The 'and' stands elliptically for *and this too*, as introducing a new quotation, descriptive of the majesty of the Son (Ps. 102 : 26-28), calling him "Lord" (κύριε, the Septuagint and New Testament equivalent of Jehovah), attributing to him the work of creation and affirming his perpetual abiding, while all created things perish. The sentiment creates no difficulty, for such is the uniform New Testament representation of Christ. Yet by the term "Lord" (κύριε), found in the Septuagint, but wanting in the Hebrew, some have supposed the author to have been misled to the applying of the language to the Messiah. Yet such a supposition is unnecessary. The author certainly makes no indiscriminating application of Old Testament passages to the Messiah; and while we need not hold that the Old Testament Scripture in speaking of God uniformly includes the Son, yet where the language, as here, points clearly to events which can only have their complete fulfillment, or indeed any proper fulfillment, through the Messiah, the Messianic reference is certainly justified. The Psalm from which this is taken belongs to a late period of the exile, and deplores, along with the writer's personal sorrows, the desolations of Zion, and the sufferings of his people. Yet her future glory breaks upon him, and the appeal for the certainty of this is to him who made the earth and heavens, and who, while they perish, will himself remain unchangeable, and whose unchangeableness guarantees the permanent abiding of his people. But this has its accomplishment only in Christ. The Being who as God's omnipotent Word made the heavens, whose breath will sweep them away (John 1 : 3; Rev. 20 : 11), and who, amidst universal change, is himself unchangeable, is none other than Christ. The whole Psalm, then, is profoundly Messianic. However dimly the Old Testament seer may have recognized its deeper import, the New Testament seer, in the triple light of proph-

11 They shall perish, but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment;
12 And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.
13 But to which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool?

11 They shall perish; but thou continuest:
And they all shall wax old as doth a garment;
12 And as a mantle shalt thou roll them up,
As a garment, and they shall be changed:
But thou art the same,
And thy years shall not fail.
13 But of which of the angels hath he said at any time,
Sit thou on my right hand,
Till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet?

ecy, history, and inspiration, clearly discerns it, and applies to the Son the language which, according to the whole tenor of the New Testament, belongs strictly to him, and to him alone.

11. They (the heavens with emphasis, but including doubtless the earth) **shall perish,** not of course by annihilation, but by change in their mode of existence. **But thou remainest**—continuest through all changes and convulsions. **And they all shall wax old as doth a garment.** Spread out (Isa. 40 : 22) as a curtain, they will grow old and be worn out.

12. And as a vesture (anything thrown about one (*περιβόλαιον*), as a vail, a mantle) **shalt thou fold them up**[1]—as a mantle is rolled up and laid aside. **And they shall be changed**—poetic Hebrew parallelism. **But thou art the same**—unchanging. (13 : 8.) **And thy years shall not fail**—again poetic parallelism, the thought being essentially the same as in the preceding clause.

13. But to which (rather, *and in respect to which*) **of the angels.** *In respect to*, or *of*, should here, as in ver. 8, take the place of 'to,' and *and* (δέ, continuative) is here better than 'but.'[2] *Hath he said* **at any time** (it is εἴρηκεν, perfect, *hath said*, not εἶπεν, *did say*, as in ver. 5). The perfect exhibits the saying as *standing before us* in its continuous result. **Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.** From Ps. 110 : 1, a psalm perhaps doubtful, whether primarily or typically Messianic. It may possibly have originated in some historical incident, as some victory of David (or one of his successors) over his enemies, which had established anew his throne upon Mount Zion. Under the influence of such a triumph there is opened to David a vision of the higher exaltation, at once royal and priestly, of his Son and Lord. And if it started as typical, it passes over into a directly Messianic character. This is attested by the nature of the Psalm itself, as (1) the Theocratic King, ruling on Mount Zion, might be properly said to be enthroned *beside* Jehovah, but scarcely at his *right hand*, which implies transcendent honor (see ver. 3); and (2) the permanent priestly functions of Melchisedek could be ascribed neither to David, nor to any of his successors. And again, (3) our Lord himself (Matt. 22 : 42-45) makes it a direct address by David to his Son and Lord. The words, "in Spirit call him" add weight to the interpretation (as showing very clearly how our Lord regarded it), and are probably suggested by the Hebrew word of the Psalm (נְאֻם), which puts it into the category of a prophecy. (See Acts 2 : 34, 35.) The military tone of the Psalm may be the echo of the recent signal victory, and is in harmony with many representations of the Messiah. Compare Ps. 2 : 9; 45 : 3-5; Rev. 6 : 2. 'On' (*out of*—ἐκ, equivalent to *close upon*) 'my right hand,' which is always the side of honor. 'Until I make' (or, *shall have made*) thine enemies thy foootstool, referring to the Oriental custom of putting the foot on the neck of conquered enemies. (Josh. 10 : 24; 1 Kings 5 : 17.) Looking, then, at the extraordinary language of this Psalm itself, at the almost unanimous interpretation of the Synagogue, certainly in New Testament times, and the probable references to it in the later prophets (as Dan. 7 : 13; Jer. 23 : 5; Zech. 6 : 12, 13), we are authorized in breaking away, in our interpretation, from all local and temporal limitations, and referring the Psalm, in its origin under the inspiring Spirit, directly to Christ. Indeed, I doubt if, with the exception possibly of the Second, there is another Psalm in the whole collection so purely Messianic. As such, it declares his

[1] So the Sinaitic and the Alexandrian Codices. The Vatican Codex reads ἀλλάξεις, *shalt change*, after the Hebrew original.

[2] Δέ almost as frequently admits of the rendering 'and' as 'but,' the slight contrastive force being too weak to be expressed in English. The Revised Version, I think, is occasionally unfortunate in preferring 'but' to 'and.'

14 Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?

14 Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to do service for the sake of them who shall inherit salvation?

CHAPTER II.

THEREFORE we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let *them* slip.

1 Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things that were heard, lest haply we drift away

united kingly and priestly character, the resistless march of his empire, and, by implication, as sharing the throne of Jehovah, his supreme divinity. With his eternal kingship at the right hand of God, we find also united his eternal priesthood after the order of Melchisedek. The priestly dignity finds its rest and support in his eternal being and kingly exaltation. Thus Christ enjoys a prerogative unknown to men (except as represented in him), and utterly foreign to angels. They bow before the throne of Jehovah, encompass it with adoring homage, hasten abroad as the glad messengers of its will, but not the loftiest of them dreams of aspiring to the transcendent dignity of a partner of the throne of the Infinite.

14. The proper functions of angels as messengers, in contrast with the lofty position of the Son. **Are they not all.** 'All' (*πάντες*) placed here emphatically in advance—all without exception, even the highest of them. Their very *name* pledges them to this. **Ministering spirits**—with reference to ver. 7. But here there is no purpose of disparagement, and the terms are used in their utmost dignity. The angels render public and, as it were, priestly service in the divine economy; there is no reference to the heavenly sanctuary. 'Spirits'—here the angels take their proper designation (the *πνεύματα* are 'spirits,' not 'winds,' as at ver. 7). The emphasis is on 'ministering.' **Sent forth**—present continued participle (*ἀποστελλόμενα*, *habitually* 'sent forth')—**to minister,** for rendering service (not the elevated word used above, but the ordinary Greek word (*διακονία*) for helpful service; whether the 'service' here is conceived as rendered also to God, *for the benefit* of his people (as Delitzsch, Lünemann, Lange), as the structure of the sentence would seem to imply[1] (they are God's ministers for); or goes with the following—thus: service for the sake of (as Kurtz), cannot perhaps be certainly determined. At all events, the subordinate ministry is to God; the service is **for them who shall be heirs,** or, *for the sake of them that are to inherit salvation.* The Scriptures abound in records of these angelic ministrations; the service may assume many forms, but it is primarily for the heirs of spiritual salvation, not conferred by the angels, but inherited as sons of God and brethren of Christ (2:10, 12; Rom. 8:29), and as such ministered to, waited upon, by the angels.

I think we have a right to assume, apart from the question of inspiration, that the Messianic application of the Psalms and other Old Testament passages in this chapter have not been made by our author carelessly and without adequate ground. A study of the Old Testament Scriptures in question points, I think, decisively in this direction; and the entire treatment of the Old Testament in this Epistle shows a profound and far-seeing and sagacious study of these older Scriptures; and if the author of the Epistle was Apollos (to whose authorship the best modern criticism is rapidly converging), the whole Epistle is a striking commentary on the description of him as "mighty in the Scriptures," fully vindicating and explaining it. The manner of handling the Scriptures is as remote as is the style from that of the Apostle Paul, while in all fundamental views they are perfectly at one. That Paul was the wider, deeper general thinker; that our author had been a closer Old Testament student, I see no reason to doubt.

Ch. 2. (3) *Brief exhortation to heed a revelation made by so extraordinary a personage. By as much as the Son is superior to the angels by so much greater the peril of disobeying his message than theirs.* (1-4.)

1. Therefore (for this reason) **we ought,** or must; yet a logical, not a natural or moral necessity. The author has through the whole

[1] As servants *διά*, *on account of, for the sake of,* the *διά* implying the purpose of the service.

2 For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and
very transgression and disobedience received a just
ecompense of reward:
3 How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salva-

2 *from them.* For if the word spoken through angels
proved stedfast, and every transgression and diso-
3 bedience received a just recompense of reward; how
shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?

Epistle a practical end in view, of which he never loses sight, to call back to the Christian faith those who were relapsing to Judaism. **To give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard**—literally, *the things which were heard* when God spoke to us through his Son.[1] The gospel revelation is called collectively the things which we have heard as corresponding to the *speaking* of the Son, in whose speaking are comprised the New Testament revelations. At 12 : 18, *et seq.*, the author, changing his representation, brings the spiritual Israel to the foot of the heavenly Zion (as the temporal Israel had come to the earthly Sinai), represents God as now speaking (λαλοῦντα) from heaven, as he then spake on earth; *that* earthly 'speaking' was from Sinai. **Lest at any time we should let them slip**—rather, *lest perchance we drift by or away from them*, as a stream flows by, or a vessel drifts by or aside upon a stream. 'Drift by or away from,' not so as to *lose the recollection* (a meaning too weak for the connection), but so as *to fail of the salvation* which they proffer.[2]

2. For—ground of the exhortation just given—**if the word spoken by** (*through*) **angels**—so immeasurably inferior to the Son—**was steadfast,** *proved abiding.* 'The word spoken through angels'; the law given on Sinai, assumed to have been given by the ministry of angels. In the account of the legislation of Sinai in Exodus, there is no mention of angels. But the song of Moses (Deut. 33 : 2), where God is said to have come forth with myriads of his holy ones (Septuagint, "angels"), and Psalm 68 : 17, where God appears in Sinai among thousands of angels, might justify the current tradition of the synagogue that the law was promulgated through angels. So in the New Testament (Acts 7 : 53): ye "received the law by the dispensation of angels"; and (Gal. 3 : 19) "*by being ministered through angels.*" To this testimony add our own passage. So Herod, in Josephus ("Antiquities," xv : 5. 3): "Having learned the holiest things in our law through angels from God." '*Proved, abiding, valid,*' so that its authority was upheld, and its violation punished. **And every transgression and disobedience**—a descending climax: *transgression* (παράβασις), *a going beyond*, or *aside from*, a positive overstepping of the law; 'disobedience' (παρακοή), *disregard, refusal to hear.* The one, false or perverse going; the other, false or perverse hearing; the latter a more subtle, less palpable violation of the law; but both equally punished, alike the *acting* in violation, and the refusal to *give heed* to it. **Received a just** (*righteous, rightful,* ἔνδικον Rom. 3 : 8) **recompense of reward.** Strictly, *rendering of reward.* All know how strictly the Mosaic legislation was adhered to; its claims were inexorable.

3. How shall we escape. 'We' emphatic; who have been taught by one so infinitely superior. 'Escape,' used absolutely, as at 12 : 25; 1 Thess. 5 : 3, for escaping the judgment of God and final condemnation. "And thinkest thou, O man?" (Rom. 2 : 3.) **If we neglect** (after neglecting) **so great salvation.** The argument still drawn from the greatness of its author, though including, as shown by its description as *salvation*, its intrinsic superiority. The words "so great," as this must be and is; the "so great" does not look forward to the following description. The following clause is added to explicate and enforce the idea. The difference is already implied in the words employed to denote the respective communications. The revelation through angels is marked by the general term 'word'; its special nature is not indicated; if it *had* been it must have pointed to wrath. That made through the Son is specifically a *salvation.* The writer

[1] The Greek aorist (light and flexible in its use) throws back the action to the time when God spoke in his Son. In this case, as often, the English perfect is not objectionable.

[2] So Clemens Alexandrinus: "To flow aside from, to lose hold of the truth" (παραῤῥυῆναι τῆς ἀληθείας). With substantial correctness Theodore of Mopsuestia: "Lest perchance we receive a diversion, a turning aside from the better things" (μήποτε παρατροπήν τινα ἀπὸ τῶν κρειττόνων δεξώμεθα. Hesychius: ἐξολισθῶμεν, *slip, slide away.*

tion; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard *him;*
4 God also bearing *them* witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will?

which having at the first been spoken through the Lord, was confirmed unto us by those who heard;
4 God also bearing witness with them, both by signs and wonders, and by manifold powers, and by [1] gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his own will.

1 Gr. *distributions.*

thus suggests a double criminality and peril in neglecting the message of the Lord; first, from the augustness of its source, the Son; second, from its intrinsic nature as a 'salvation,' the neglect of which leaves them to the ruin from which it proffers them deliverance. On both grounds the 'how' is equivalent to an emphatic negative. **Which at the first began[1] to be spoken by the Lord.** The high prerogative of this salvation is that its original announcement was not through angels, but the Lord (the name which is above every name). Both the dispensations are ultimately alike from God, but neither from him directly; and their relative excellence may be inferred from the dignity of their respective mediators. In giving the law God employed angels, in giving the gospel, his Son; in the one, servants; in the other, the Lord. The beginning, then, is here not the ultimate, but the historical origin of the two dispensations. "The Lord" is here, as often, used absolutely. It is the Septuagint and New Testament equivalent, sometimes of Jehovah, sometimes of Adonai. **And was confirmed** (transmitted with firm and reliable testimony, placed beyond all doubt) **unto** (or, *for*) **us**—the succeeding generations. **By them that heard him** (or, that heard it, that is, from him). It came to us from immediate eye and ear witnesses, the personal followers of Jesus. The writer classes himself with his readers as those who received the gospel at second-hand. This of itself would decide the authorship of the Epistle as non-Pauline. Paul claims uniformly and positively to "have seen the Lord Jesus Christ," to have received both his commission and his doctrine from the revelation of Jesus Christ (Gal. 1:12; 2:4), and admits no dependence on, or inferiority to, the other Apostles (1 Cor. 15:10; 2 Cor. 11:5). It is incredible that when opposing Judaising teachers and tendencies, he should so strenuously vindicate his apostolical prerogatives, and here so utterly ignore them. We certainly have not here the always lofty, though never arrogant, tone of the apostle to the Gentiles.

4. But the testimony of these disciples did not stand alone—**God also bearing them witness** (God along with them bearing added witness). To the testimony of their words he added that of supernatural deeds, wrought through their hands. **Both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles.** The words denote the same thing under different points of view; they are 'signs,' or *proofs*, as confirming the genuineness of the messenger or message; 'wonders,' or *portents*, as transcending the ordinary course of nature; 'miracles'—strictly, *acts of power*, mighty works, as wrought by divine power. Miracles confirmed the divine mission of our Lord and the divine origin of the infant church. *Powers* (δυνάμεις) is the name of a special charisma (1 Cor. 12:28), probably the working of miracles; here the reference is probably to the general working of miracles by the apostles. (Acts 2:43.) **And gifts of the Holy Ghost**—*impartings of the Holy Spirit.* The Holy Spirit is the genitive of the object, not of the subject; distributions, bestowments of the Holy Spirit. **According to his own will**—that is, according to God's will. The Holy Spirit is sent by Christ or the Father, as the fruit of Christ's ascension (John 16:7, 8; Eph. 4:7; Acts 2:38), "who being by the right hand of God exalted." The Spirit sent of God, with almighty agency, ministered those various gifts, as prophecy, miraculous healings, speaking with tongues. From another point of view, bestowed by the sovereign pleasure of the Spirit, who acts freely, though subordinately. 'According to his own will.' They could not be taken at the option of the individual, and were legitimate objects of desire and prayer (1 Cor. 12:31; 14:13); and while God imparted them as he would, doubtless in the church they were bestowed according to special exigencies and peculiar individual endowments. All these are "powers of the world to come." (6:5.)

1 'First began'—literally, *to take a beginning:* ἀρχὴν λαβεῖν, not found elsewhere in the New Testament, but in Philo, "Vita Moses," i, 614, E.

5 For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak.

5 For not unto angels did he subject [1] the world to

1 Gr. *the inhabited earth.*

Thus closes this first hortatory passage. Each of the three grand argumentative sections of the Epistle (see Analysis) contains such a hortatory passage, being successively longer and more cogent, as the argument deepens in intensity. This is naturally the shorter of the three, yet in this is cogently put the peril of disregarding the salvation brought by the Lord, and implied that the readers are in danger of disregarding it.

(4) *Christ, though as Son infinitely superior to the angels, yet was humbled temporarily below them, that, suffering and dying as man, he might rescue and elevate his human brethren, and, as a faithful High Priest, reconcile them to God.* (5–18.)

5. For unto the angels hath he not (*For not unto angels did he*) **put in subjection the world to come** (or, *the coming age*) **whereof we speak** (*are speaking*). The practical passage just closed leads to a new stage in the discussion. It has presented the Son of God as the *Son of man*, as the *Bearer of salvation*, first publishing it in his own person, and then carrying it forward by divinely commissioned and divinely equipped human agents. The world of redemption opens upon our view, that 'future world,' which, with all its spiritual powers, its pregnant hopes, its accomplished salvation, had been the theme of prophecy, and the expectation of Israel. This also has been placed under the government of the Son. He has been exalted as its Supreme Head; but no longer as the absolute Son of God, the Eternal Logos, the Creator and Sustainer of the universe, but as the Son of man, raised, in his human nature, above every name that is named, and crowned with glory and honor. This topic then subserves a double purpose: it illustrates Christ's super-angelic dignity, and it opens the way, by an easy transition, to the fact so offensive to every Jewish mind, of Christ's humiliation and death on the cross. Why did he who was exalted infinitely above the angels appear far below them? It was to restore to man his pristine and normal dignity, to bring universal humanity into new relations to God, and, by an expiatory death, to become qualified to lead unnumbered sons of God to glory. Under this view, the course of thought of the following verses will be clear. 'For' refers not (with De Wette) back to 1 : 14, nor (with Delitzsch) does it merely take up and carry forward the general thought of the foregoing passage, but (with Moll and Kurtz) enforces the exhortation to give heed to the things which have been heard, and not neglect the Messianic salvation, inasmuch as it is not to angels, but to the Son—not now the Son of God, but the Son of man—that this coming age, this world to be, has been placed in subjection. The Old Testament law was given through angels; the New Testament salvation was brought through Christ. There may, perhaps, be also a reference to the Jewish conception that the several departments of the world were under the guardianship of angels; though this was true but of heathen nations and princes (see Deut. 32 : 8, Septuagint; Dan. 4 : 13), while the Jews are under immediate divine guidance. But at all events, angels, except as mere ministers, retire from the scene, and *man*, glorified and ideal in the person of his Representative, fills the foreground of the picture. Most beautifully appropriate becomes the following citation, which connects Christ's humiliation with his exaltation, and this again with the restoration of humanity to its ideal position: 'Not unto angels did he put in subjection.' Angels placed emphatically in advance, and without the article, to emphasize not the individuals, but the class. 'Put in subjection' might easily be suggested by the just enumerated tokens of power that marked the Messianic era, and also by that coming passage from the Psalms, which the writer already has in his mind, 'The world to come' —the world to be, the future, or coming world; here, not the "*age* to come," but the concrete inhabited (οἰκουμένην) world (as in 1 : 6), the world created good, and laid under the curse of sin and death, and now to be filled with the blessings of redemption; a world already existing in its spiritual agencies, but demanding for its full development of blessedness a new heaven and a new earth. The full gospel salvation, "the city that hath foundations," is through this Epistle (as everywhere with Paul) still in the future. As the "future age," it consists of

6 But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him?
7 Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands:

6 come, whereof we speak. But one hath somewhere testified, saying,
What is man that thou art mindful of him?
Or the son of man, that thou visitest him?
7 Thou madest him [1] a little lower than the angels;
Thou crownedst him with glory and honour,
[2] And didst set him over the works of thy hands:

1 Or, *for a little while lower*.....2 Many authorities omit *And didst . . . . hands.*

the brief ante-resurrection period and the infinite beyond; as the 'coming world,' it consists of the threshold of the temple and the infinite temple. 'Whereof we are speaking'—referring, probably, not to the entire scope of the Epistle, but to this particular section of it.

6. With the declaration 'not unto the angels,' etc., the author had doubtless in mind, "but unto the Son," or "unto the Son of man," or some such expression. But having in mind the passage in the Psalm, from which he was to draw his illustration, he overleaps the intermediate step, and lets the citation, which virtually involves the contrasted statement, take the place of the statement itself.[1] **But one in a certain place** (*somewhere*) **testified,** etc. 'But' (δέ) is here slightly adversative, as introducing over against the negative statement that it is not angels to whom the world of salvation was subjected, the counter and positive doctrine that it is *man*, and especially as idealized and represented in the Son of man, the Messiah. The citation is from Ps. 8 : 4–6. The words 'some one,' 'somewhere,' do not imply ignorance or doubt of the authorship or locality of the passage. The accuracy of the citation shows that it is not from memory, and a like 'somewhere' occurs at 4 : 4, concerning a passage regarding which there could be no doubt. The use of the words is purely rhetorical. The half mysterious mode of citation lends a certain dignity and elegance to the style, and while withholding the name of the author, leaves the attention fixed on the passage.[2] Lünemann notices a similar reticence in Philo.

The passage here introduced is felicitously selected as pointing to the ideal character and natural destination of humanity, that it may be therein shown how these are realized in the glorified Jesus, and that, too, on behalf of humanity, and thus be explained the enigma of his humiliation.

What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the Son of man, that thou visitest him? Better, perhaps, *a man* and *a Son of man.* The second clause is a mere poetical parallel of the first. The theme of the Psalm (8) is the dignity of humanity and its exaltation above all inanimate nature on the ground of the utterance in Gen. 1 : 26, 28, of man's creation in the image of God, and his investiture with the lordship of this lower creation. The introduction of the Psalm points, as against the glory and magnificence of the heavens, to that littleness and apparent insignificance of *man*, which only makes more wonderful his moral elevation, and his rule over this wide creation.[3] Whether our author introduces the Psalm primarily in its earthly and natural character (as Delitzsch, Moll), or as immediately Messianic (as Bleek, Lünemann, Kurtz), I shall consider by-and-by. But having directed attention to man's littleness, he proceeds to declare his loftiness.

7. Thou madest him a little lower than the angels. The author quotes from the Septuagint: "*Thou didst lower him some little below* (in comparison with) *angels.*" The Hebrew original reads: "Thou didst lower him some little below Elohim," which without the article may very properly be rendered angels (instead of God), as the Septuagint and the Targumists and modern scholars; and the more appropriately, says Kurtz, as "the Psalmist's reference is not so much to

[1] Under the handling of Paul such a procedure would have marked the fiery energy of his style; under that of our author it marks deliberate and elegant art, as also the *some one* and *somewhere* that introduce the quotation.

[2] I doubt, indeed, if the 'somewhere,' both here and at 4 : 4, should not rather be "perhaps," "I suppose," not as implying any doubt more than above, but as a particle of modesty, a *mere mode of putting the case.* That πού is frequently so used, both in δή που and alone. I need not argue.

[3] I think it worth our reflection that when we look at the mental and moral positions of man in the universe, every enlargement by science of the realm of nature only lends in our conception added majesty to man's.

8 Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing *that is* not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him.

8 Thou didst put all things in subjection under his feet.
For in that he subjected all things unto him, he left nothing that is not subject to him. But now we see

the personality as to the spiritual nature of angels which they share with God." The "little lower" is here of *degree:* in the subsequent application it becomes a "little lower" of *time.* **Thou crownedst him with glory and honour**—referring to man's original constitution; 'glory'—his intrinsic brightness, the image of the divine, and but little inferior to the angelic; 'honour'—his elevation above the earth and its creatures in dignity and authority. The two passages illustrate each other. **And didst set him over the works of thy hands.** This passage is found in the Codex Sinaiticus, but is wanting in many MSS. It was omitted by our author, as not essential to his purpose.

8. Thou hast put (or, *didst put*) **all things in subjection under his feet.** In the Psalm this clearly refers to the dominion over the earth with which man was invested at his creation. That this is man's ideal position is evident enough even amidst all the wrecking of his nature, and darkening of his glory, which has been made by sin. **For in that he put all in subjection under him,** literally, *for in subjecting to him all things.* **He left nothing that is not put under him**—*unsubjected to him.* The writer has finished his quotation, and proceeds to a logical deduction. That the passage was commonly used as Messianic may be inferred from a like mode of reasoning from it (though for a different end) in 1 Cor. 15 : 27. "But when he saith," etc. The author here, however, draws simply the natural inference from the language; he merely explicates what it contains by implication. It has declared that God has subjected to man all things (the 'to him' refers, of course, to 'man'). The expression, says the author, is absolute; it implies an unlimited and universal subjection. The writer is not stating what God did, but what the language *implies* that he did, and which yet we do not see verified in the case of actual humanity. **But now we see not yet all things put under him.** The 'now' and the 'not yet' are generally taken as temporal, not logical. I prefer to regard them, especially the 'now' (νῦν), as logical, and would give to the 'under him' (αὐτῷ) the force of its emphatic position. I would render: "But as it is, as the case stands, we do not at all see, we by no means see that to him all things have been subjected." That they will bear this rendering (especially the νῦν δέ) just as easily as the other, both by classical and New Testament usage, I need not stop to argue.[1] That this is the sense here, at least of 'now' (νῦν), I feel certain. The author is reasoning. A certain statement is made in relation to man which is not actualized in the condition of humanity, and which therefore is transferred to a Representative of that humanity in whom it is. The 'but now' and 'not yet' then as particles of time are here out of place; as far as they go they weaken the argument, for it becomes a matter of *time:* if by-and-by the realization may occur, the author need not look elsewhere for its true original. But in fact the picture is not fulfilled in man, and has no prospect of being, until a heavenly man appears on the scene, in whose exaltation he finds a precursor and pledge of the future exaltation of humanity. But that is not here in question, but simply the discrepancy between the portraiture and the supposed original, whence he argues to a true original of the portraiture itself. The temporal force of the particles[2] therefore is less relevant, and mars the purity of the reasoning. The declaration then is that the Psalmist's ascription of a universal ascendancy to man is not borne out by man's actual condition. He is a slave to a blighted and barren earth, to disordered elements, to savage beasts, and to pain, sickness, and death. Those who (as Bleek, Lünemann, Kurtz) apply the *quotation* directly to Christ take, of course, these particles temporally, and with a very modified interpretation of the passage. They distinguish expressly between being "crowned with glory and honour," and

[1] The οὔπω, properly *not at all, in no way,* is indeed, in its ordinary use, *not yet,* and has chiefly, though not exclusively, in poetry, the meaning, "by no means."

[2] The Lexicons scarcely do justice to οὔπω; yet its logical force is far less to be assumed; the combination νῦν δέ is more common in the New Testament in its logical than in its temporal sense (νῦν δέ and νυνὶ δέ).

9 But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.

9 not yet all things subjected to him. But we behold him who hath been made [1]a little lower than the angels, *even* Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour, that by the grace

1 Or, *for a little while lower.*

having "all in subjection under him." The former Christ has already received; the latter is in the future, awaiting him at the final judgment, when all his enemies shall have been put under him. But to this interpretation there are strong objections. (1) We can scarcely doubt that the phrases, "crowned with glory and honour" and having "all things in subjection under him," are used as substantial equivalents, the one implying all that is expressed by the other. (2) With this distinction the second thought should not come in here at all (as the purpose is to declare his present exaltation), unless perhaps as a mere subordinate proposition, with a particle (*μέν*), signifying, *indeed, to be sure*, simply to pave the way for the emphatic affirmative statement: "But now we do not as yet indeed (*οὔπω μεν*) see all things put under him; but we *do* see him crowned with glory and honor." (3) The formal and elaborate manner in which Jesus is introduced at ver. 9, in manifest contrast with the previously mentioned personage, shows unmistakably that *then first* the author bends upon him the conclusions of the preceding citation. In short, the view which makes Jesus at once the object of the entire citation destroys its coherence of thought and the clearness of the argumentation, makes inexplicable the formal opening of ver. 9, and entangles inextricably the whole passage. In contrast with the fact that all things are not yet, or, not at all, subjected to man, the author proceeds.

9. But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels—or, more exactly, *But him who had been lowered for some little below the angels, Jesus, we behold.* The author elegantly puts the description before the name as more characteristic—as also elsewhere, "the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, Jesus" (3:1); as in the Greek, "the Leader and Perfecter of faith, Jesus" (12:2)—and adds, thoughtfully, and, as it were, lovingly, for the first time, the earthly human name of him whom he had before styled Son, God, Lord. He here turns the passage to Christ, and shows that in him both parts of the description are substantially realized, and that he, therefore, is the true archetype and realization of the Psalmist's picture. The language of the Psalm, then, naturally modifies itself (the Holy Spirit recasting his own language) to meet the new exigencies. The "being lowered" is the Lord's own voluntary stoop; the "some little" of degree passes into a "some little" of time (and the more easily, as suggested by Delitzsch, because humanity's own subordination to the angels is rather an accident of its position, than grounded in its essential nature), and the "being crowned with glory," instead of being coincident in time with the humiliation, is at once its successor and its reward. With great skill has the writer, in addressing Hebrews, to whom the incarnation was naturally an offense, united in one the ideal condition of man with the humiliation of the Son of man, as he immediately after makes his suffering of death the condition of his glorification. **For the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour.** Rather, *On account of his suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor.* By this exacter rendering, 'the suffering of death' paves the way for his glorification, instead of being represented as the purpose of his humiliation;[1] according, also, to the more usual New Testament mode of representation. Here, where the author first expressly mentions the suffering of death, he would affect most favorably his Hebrew brethren by introducing it, not as the object of the humiliation, but as the *condition of the exaltation.* Below, when he has familiarized his readers with the idea and the purpose of his death, he may speak of his assuming flesh and blood in order to die, and by dying rescue humanity. But here it accords with the general careful strain of the Epistle, to put the first reference to the death in the most favorable light. 'Crowned with glory and honour' is here the clear equivalent of the having 'all things subjected to him,' with which it is associated in ver. 7, 8. It refers to Christ's exal-

1 The *purpose* would have been more naturally expressed by *ἕνεκα τοῦ παθεῖν*, than by *διὰ τὸ παθεῖν*, or *πάθημα*.

tation after his resurrection, when God raised him above the rage of his enemies, anointed him eternal King and Priest, declared him his Son in power, and gave him all power in heaven and earth. The author, then, has reached the proof of the thesis, virtually involved in ver. 5, that not to angels, but to the Son of man, and that, as man's representative and head, God had subjected this new and opening world of redemption. With circuitous, but sure step, he has brought round his argument, till he finds in him who has had all things subjected to him, and has been crowned with glory and honor, the true ideal of the Psalmist's picture, and the One to whom this coming world has been really made subject. But into the web of his reasoning he has skillfully woven the fact of the humiliation and death of this glorious Personage, and shown the two classes of facts inseparably united. This point being established, and the humiliation and death, as it were, incidentally introduced, he passes to them as the principal objects of his picture. The glorified Messiah recedes; the suffering and dying Jesus, brought forward with exquisite art, comes into the foreground. The whole arrangement he tells us—alike the humiliation and the exaltation has been made—**that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man**—or, *In order that by the grace of God, on behalf of every man, he might taste of death.* This clause has been very variously constructed. For "in order that" (ὅπως) some render 'so that' (equivalent to ὥστε), others, 'after'—both erroneously. The particle denotes *purpose.* But with what is it connected? The construction with 'made lower' across the intervening clause is extremely harsh; that with 'crowned'—as the crowning *follows* the death—is no less so (he was crowned that he might taste, etc.); unless we either render the verb "that he might have tasted," which is scarcely possible, or throw the emphasis entirely on 'for every man' (ὑπὲρ παντός), and make the clause pregnantly equivalent to "that the death which he has tasted might be on behalf of every one" (somewhat analogously to 1 Peter 4 : 6). The passage, so explained, would yield a good sense, but would deprive the words 'taste of death' of their apparently intended emphasis. Tholuck, Lünemann and Kurtz make the clause a resumption, and a brief, but pregnant, exponent of the words, "on account of his suffering of death"; the author returning to it to add, "to wit, that by the grace of God," etc. So, pretty nearly, Delitzsch, who, however, refers it rather to the entire clause, "on account of his suffering of death, crowned," etc., making it assign the reason why Christ's glorification was made conditional upon his previous suffering of death; namely, that being *thus* exalted (passing through death to exaltation) his death might be for the exaltation of humanity. The clause seems appended rather loosely to the entire verse, to bring out the general idea that the entire arrangement—the humbling and the subsequent exaltation—was for the good of universal humanity. The humiliation was, that he might taste of death; the exaltation was, that the death might be effectual for every man—the whole was by the grace of God. The emphasis is about equally distributed on the three clauses—the less welcome being reserved to be prepared for by the other two. A humbled and dying Messiah was utterly repugnant to the Jewish notions of their expected Messiah; its mention is naturally preceded by the glories that are to crown it. *First*, is *the grace of God.* The author commends the fact about to be stated by assuring his readers that it was by the gracious purpose of God. To such an arrangement no Jew could urge objection. This fact must reconcile him to a suffering and dying Messiah, and this clause is of great significance.[1] *Secondly*, the arrangement is rec-

[1] On the other hand, the reading found in many MSS., namely, χωρὶς θεοῦ, but which, in the sixth century, had disappeared entirely, yet has found some recent advocates, is devoid of any intelligible purpose. It has been interpreted with γεύεσθαι θανάτου, "to taste of death apart from God"—that is, purely in his human nature; or, separately from—that is, forsaken of God; or, with ὑπὲρ παντός, "on behalf of every creature except God," analogously to 1 Cor. 15 : 27. But the exception in the case of God to the otherwise universal subjection so appropriate there, would be childish and unmeaning here. Man is here alone referred to; if any exceptions were in order, it would much more naturally be angels. The critics are probably right in supposing the words originally a marginal gloss on the phrase, "left nothing unsubjected to him" (that is, writes the commentator, "except God," χωρὶς θεοῦ), and this, mistaken by a careless copyist for a correction of the text (χάριτι θεοῦ) a little below, was put into its place.

10 For it became him, for whom *are* all things, and by whom *are* all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.

10 of God he should taste death for every *man*. For it became him, for whom are all things, and through whom are all things, [1]in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the [2]author of their salvation perfect

1 Or, *having brought*.....2 Or, *captain*.

ommended as being "on behalf of every man." It was in the interest of individual and collective humanity; it was to *realize* the Psalmist's description of the normal condition of humanity, and thus fulfill the Old Testament Scriptures. Thus he might become the Saviour of all men, especially of them that should believe. The extension of the 'every' (παντός) beyond man—either as neuter, *every* thing, to the whole creation; or as masculine, to other beings, as angels—is without the scope of the writer. He is thinking of the effects of redemption, not on the universe generally, but on the human race; and here, not so much of the realized results in individual salvation, as of the general scope and purpose of Christ's death in bringing man into new relations to God, and in making possible to all, and actual to many, the fulfillment of their original destination. It is the inference from the passage so skillfully chosen as the text, that man, ideally placed above all, is actually so placed through his Representative and Deliverer, Jesus. *Thirdly*, and emphatically, that which Christ, by the grace of God and for the benefit of all, was to do, was to 'taste death.' It is this with which the author is familiarizing his readers in connection with, and as a means of, the exaltation of man. 'Tasting of death' is a figure familiar enough to poetry generally, and common in the Greek classics, yet here probably of Hebrew origin. It is not designed to indicate a *brief* and transient experiencing of death (as but a mere *tasting*), but is rather an emphatic and elegant periphrasis. 'Tasting of death,' as referring to a sense which tests things in their inner nature, denotes rather intimacy and depth, than superficiality of experience.

10-18. These verses expand and vindicate the sentiment of the last clause; namely, that by God's gracious arrangement Jesus Christ suffered death on behalf of every man. The passage is one of great tenderness, the terms "sons," "brethren," "children," indicating the sympathetic compassion which prompted the humiliation of the Redeemer.

10. This states in fuller form, and as leading to still further expansion, the threefold idea of the last clause, and in the same order: (1) Answering to the 'by the grace of God,' we have **For it became him, for** (διά with accusative) **whom are all things, and by** (*through*) **whom are all things.** The first preposition—*for, on account of*—as naturally applies to the Father as to the Son; for the second—*by, through*—we might have expected *from, out of* (ἐξ), or, perhaps, *by* (ὑπό), of ultimate agency, though with an intransitive verb; but the reasoning can scarcely be mistaken. God is described by those attributes which vindicate his right to arrange, unchallenged, for advancing the dignity of his creatures; and the phrase 'it became'—*was becoming, befitting*—marks an internal reason for the arrangement lying in the very nature of the case and in his relations to man. Answering to the 'for (*on behalf of*) every man,' we have next, **bringing many sons unto glory.** This indicates the largeness of God's purpose regarding the death of Christ, and vindicates his subjection to the suffering which should qualify him for the work. God is everywhere the ultimate agent in bringing sinners to salvation. Jesus Christ becomes the file-leader (ἀρχηγός) and Captain of the sacramental host. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son," etc. (John 3:16.) God saves and leads to glory his people, as he made the world, *through* his Son. 'Many sons' stands (Delitzsch) here distinguished from *one*, and in antithesis to *few*. Had God been satisfied (the writer intimates) with the eternal glory of the One and Only-begotten, he might have spared that one his path of trial and suffering. But he would have it partaken by '*many* sons,' and shrunk not from the steps required for its accomplishment. It has been questioned whether the participle "bringing" (ἀγαγόντα, *leading*) refers back to "him"—namely, God, or forward to 'Captain,' Leader; whether to the Father, or to Christ; whether the 'leading' is here supreme or subordinate. Both constructions are grammatically possible; but the former is

easier and more natural.[1] But applying the participle to God, what is its import? Not that of a contemporaneous and continued act, *while leading* (ἄγοντα), nor of purpose, *in order to lead* (ἄξοντα), nor, *in leading* (ἐν τῷ ἄγειν). It *might* be used, perhaps, here in the sense of "as leading, as one who led"; and thus belong equally well to the preceding or following, marking God's leadership, or Christ's leadership; but a construction somewhat harsh and doubtful. The two regular and natural constructions are: (1) "*after leading, having led—to perfect*," etc.; (2) *leading, to perfect*, equivalent to, to lead and to perfect, making the participle and the infinitive co-ordinate. But in what sense the former? It might denote that God, after leading many Old Testament saints to glory, must now, at the opening of the New Testament times, perfect, through suffering, their Leader, with the unexpressed thought of his being Captain of a yet mightier host in the future. Considering the relation of this Epistle to the Old Testament, I do not think this view unworthy of consideration. If the Old Testament saints only are *mentioned*, the New Testament saints would, of course, be understood as to follow under the new and perfected conditions. Kurtz modifies this view, adopting this as the only natural construction. Answering to God as the Author of all things, the 'sons' are God's sons by creation, and thus all men; and the 'bringing to glory' thus far realized is only the bringing them on the way to that glory into which none of them had as yet entered, but which awaited them in the Messianic times.[2] The second (2) of the views above given virtually co-ordinates the participle with the verb; namely, leading many sons to perfect, etc., equivalent to, to lead many sons and to perfect. Thus the action expressed by the participle, as well as that of the infinitive, falls under the 'it became' (ἔπρεπεν). It not merely 'became' God, as one leading, or after leading,' etc., to perfect their leader by sufferings, but it became him to do the one as well as the other. The fitness consisted not merely in appointing him to die after he had undertaken a certain work, but also in undertaking the work which would require him to die. It gives more breadth and force to the argument to throw back the fittingness from the adjustment of the means to the end, to the end itself.[3] Thus I incline on the whole to render as if it were "to bring many sons to glory, and perfect through sufferings the leader of their salvation." An objection urged against connecting the participle with the following, so as to make *Christ* the one bringing the many sons to glory is that in that case they would be spoken of not as 'sons,' but as 'brethren.' This, however, would be by no means certain. In relation to him, indeed, they would be 'brethren,' but in his and their common relation to God they are sons; and it would not be unnatural that he, as Son, should be spoken of as bringing *many* sons to glory. **To make the captain** (or, *leader*) **of their salvation perfect through sufferings.** This clause answers finally to 'taste of death' in the preceding verse. It is put euphemistically, for the humiliation and crucifixion of the Son. It is conceived not in the light of a death; it is a perfecting, qualifying both by internal discipline and by outward glorification. The emphasis is generally said to lie on 'suffering'; but whether in the author's conception it quite does so may be doubted. He is softening to his readers the doctrine of the cross, exhibiting it in its most favorable, and at the same time its justest, light. Does he not therefore reserve for final and special

[1] With the second, the predicate participle (ἀγαγόντα) may be construed with the following noun, 'the Captain of their salvation,' as one leading, or having led. With the first, the participle would naturally, indeed, be ἀγαγόντι, agreeing with αὐτῷ, or might equally well, as ἀγαγόντα, agree with the accusative subject of τελειῶσαι.

[2] Hofmann's ingenious conceit that the many sons brought to glory were, Moses to the prophetic dignity, Aaron to the high priesthood, David to the kingship, etc., as the Son was now to be brought to the honor of glorifying humanity, with its strange perversion of the words 'glory' (δόξα) and 'salvation' (σωτηρία), needs no refutation. As ordinarily explained, the passage is a grand appeal to the benevolence of God on behalf of the unpalatable facts of the incarnation and crucifixion, and all that lay between. It is difficult to see what purpose Hofmann's view could subserve.

[3] This double use of the aorist participle is among the most familiar in Greek. Thus: "He bade them, opening their treasures, present gifts" (ἐκέλευσεν αὐτους θησαυρους ἀνοιξαντας δῶρα δοῦναι), might be either, "He bade them, after opening their treasures, present gifts," or, "He bade them open their treasures and present gifts." The participle might equally well be an *incidental* precedent and condition of the "presenting," or a *required* condition coming under the ἐκέλευσεν.

11 For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified *are* all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren,
12 Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee.

11 through sufferings. For both he who sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause
12 he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying,
I will declare thy name unto my brethren,
In the midst of the [1]congregation will I sing thy praise.

1 Or, *church*.

emphasis the word 'perfect' (τελειῶσαι) as containing the whole fullness of his vindication? thus, not 'to make perfect through sufferings,' but *through sufferings to make perfect*. The sufferings are of no value except as they qualify their subject for his work; they are subordinate to the perfecting and consummating for his work the Leader of salvation. Hence, if it behooves God to lead him through sufferings, much more through these sufferings *to make him perfect*. The word is complex in meaning: the "perfecting" is partly inward, partly outward. It embraces at once the legal fitness which Christ's death imparted to him to become a Saviour, the moral fitness which it engendered to become a sympathizing high priest, and the glorified state to which it raised him; and as the Leader of his followers, it was not intrinsic, but relative perfection—perfection for his followers, that required his death. 'Through sufferings' is used pregnantly (διά), at once as a *means* and a *way*. He attained his legal and moral fitness as a Redeemer, through sufferings as a medium; he passed to his heavenly glory through sufferings as a way. The 'salvation' of this clause is the 'glory' of the preceding; it is that side of the glorification which belongs to the 'many sons,' but not to the single Son. He was glorified, but not saved (except in a very qualified sense); they were both saved and glorified, their salvation being completed and crowned by glorification. Till then they are saved but in hope (Rom. 8:24); saved but approximately. "Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed." In like manner it presently appears as sanctification. 'Captain' or *Leader* (ἀρχηγός); properly *first in a series*, file leader, then Prince, Leader; then, *founder*, *originator*, which seems its meaning here, as at 5:9—"author (αἴτιος) of eternal salvation." Philo calls Adam the (ἀρχηγός) *head* and *file leader* of the race, conducting them on to a common goal with himself. The common Sonship to God of Christ and his people, stated above, is now further developed as ground of the fittingness (ἔπρεπεν) of God's thus humbling his Son. The following passage is not a mere incidental justification of the 'many sons' above, but a link in the chain of argument that establishes the necessity (*since therefore*, ἐπεὶ οὖν, ver. 14) of the incarnation and sufferings of the Lord.

11. For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified[1] are all of (properly, *from*) **one**—that is, from one Father, and this not from one earthly father, Adam, but from one Heavenly Father, God; and from him, not as universal Father (Creator and Preserver), but as spiritual Father and Regenerator; "sons of God, which were born not of blood, . . . but from God." See John 1:13; Rom. 8:14, seq.; 1 John 3:1. As equivalents of 'leading to glory,' 'glorified,' we have 'sanctifieth' and 'sanctified,' describing the glorification in its deeper spiritual character, the moral transformation that must precede, and be the essence of, any true outward exaltation. The verb (ἁγιάζω, *consecrate*, *make holy*) is doubtless chosen with reference to the "make perfect" (τελειοῦν), and denotes ritual, and then moral perfection. "For their sakes," says the Saviour, "I sanctify, consecrate, myself." (John 17:19.) He, already holy, needed but the formal and ritual sanctification; they, fallen and guilty, needed an internal and spiritual one. **For which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren.** The language delicately intimates both the likeness and the unlikeness, both the parity and the disparity of the Redeemer and the redeemed. As being from one Father, they are alike sons, yet as infinitely superior to them in original glory and in moral purity, it is a condescension in him to acknowledge the fraternal tie. He *might* be 'ashamed to call them brethren,' but is not. He concedes to them at once the name of brethren, and the affection which the name implies.

12. Saying, I will declare thy name

[1] Οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι, present, not perfect participle, either as denoting those who are in process of sanctification or the successive subjects of sanctification.

13 And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given me.

13 And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold, I and the children whom God hath given

unto my brethren, in the midst of the church (*congregation*) **will I sing praise unto thee.** This is from Ps. 22 : 22, a Psalm of David which, with its many striking correspondences to the Lord's earthly history, may clearly be called typico-prophetical; in which the minstrel-prophet, already anointed by Samuel and speedily destined to the throne, yet now persecuted and in flight, pours out his complaints over the wretchedness of his condition, yet finally rejoices in the assurance of ultimate deliverance, and the universal triumph of the kingdom of God. It is one of those Psalms which, originally uttered by David, the type of Christ in respect to his own personal condition, had, in the purpose of the inspiring Spirit, a still higher application to the Son of David, while, in the days of his flesh and a subject of exile and persecution, he with strong crying and tears called upon God, and saw in the far-off distance his crown and triumph. The anointed, yet temporarily exiled David stands for the anointed, yet exiled Jesus. History unrolls the scroll of prophecy. Christ, as the antitype of Moses, of David, of Solomon, gives the true significance to their character and history, just as the Christian Church reproduces and illustrates the fortunes of the Jewish congregation; and the heavenly Canaan and the New Jerusalem furnish their "true rest" and "the city which hath foundations" to the people of God. The Messianic character of the Psalm is indicated by our Lord's borrowing its language on the cross: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" The citation is made verbally from the Septuagint, with the exchange of (διηγήσομαι), *I will recount, declare*, for (ἀπαγγελῶ), *I will report, will bring back tidings*, which, less applicable to David, is beautifully so to Christ, who brings back to his earthly brethren a report from his heavenly home. (John 3 : 11, seq.) The passage implies David's, and through him his greater Son's, recognition of Israel, here, of course, the spiritual Israel, as his brethren. A condescension in the earthly David, it was infinitely more so in the heavenly.

13. And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given me. Still other citations to illustrate the community of Sonship between Christ and his people. The previous one was taken from David, who, as a type of Christ, recognizes the brotherly relation between himself and the congregation of Israel; these two are from Isaiah, also a type of Christ, whose very name means Saviour, and whose clear predictions of the Messiah constitute him the "evangelical prophet." They are taken from Isa. 8 : 17, 18, from a transaction in which Isaiah appears specially in his typical character. They occur continuously, but are separated by the author by an 'and again,' probably because they bring out different phases of the Messiah's relation to his brethren and to God. The entire passage is beyond a question typical. Isaiah, fraught with the "spirit of Jesus," typifies the Saviour; and his children, given him specially from God, having symbolical significance, betoken partly present wrath and distress, partly the deliverance which will yet break through the surrounding judgments. 'I will put my trust in him' for future deliverance, exclaims the Representative of the Messiah, and, as a pledge of that deliverance, 'Behold I and the children that God hath given to me.' The bearing of the first of these citations upon the author's purpose consists in the fact that it represents (typically) the Messiah as putting his trust in God, and thus exhibits him and his followers in a common relation of dependence, and therefore virtually on a level. The second points out this community still more directly. The speaker and the children that God gave to him are placed in the same category, and appear as brethren. In the mouth of the prophet, the type, the children are *his* children, given him by God. In the mouth of Jesus, the antitype, they are God's children, whom he gave to his Son, and of whom, therefore, he is the elder brother. (John 6 : 37; 17 : 6.) The difference in the cases is accidental; the likeness is essential. In both, the children are given to the typical and to the real Messiah, specially and marvelously by God; in both, they sustain a relation of dependence; in both, by community of nature, a virtual equality. The human father is the fleshly brother of his

children. The entire purpose of our author sends him to the Old Testament for illustrations of the character and relations of Christ. From the nature of the case, then, his illustrations must be drawn largely from its symbols, for in those are its Messianic predictions mostly contained. The merely verbal prophecies of Christ in the Old Testament are far less numerous than its *acted* prophecies, and not a whit more pertinent and satisfactory. Our author's use, therefore, of symbolical cases, like the present, was legitimate, not merely from the Jewish point of view, but from every point of view. A reference to the ninth chapter abundantly confirms here the Messianic interpretation.[1] The first step in the proof of the fittingness of God's proceeding in humbling his Son is taken in showing the relation of *brotherhood* existing between the Saviour and the saved. In this relation the author latently finds already an argument for this proceeding. They for whom the Son of God died are sons of God; they for whom the Redeemer suffered are his brethren. It may, indeed, be objected that, as they are not sons and brethren until *after* they are redeemed, their being such can be no logical ground for the redemptive sacrifice. True, in strict logic. But that which God saw that they were capable of becoming, and would become, may, without violence, be ideally transferred to their previous condition. They were sons *proleptically;* by anticipation. God saw in them sons; Christ saw in them brethren; and hence it became God to humble his Son, and Christ to humble himself, in order to lead them to glory. Kurtz avoids the proleptic view by taking, as already seen, the 'sons' to be ransomed, not as sons, by their descent from Adam, but by virtue of their creation in the image of God: and the Ransomer then becomes, not the Theanthropic Son of God, but the pre-incarnate and eternal Son of God, as the "effulgence of his glory and the impress of his substance." There can be no doubt that in this essential and eternal Sonship is laid the basis of his theanthropic relation; it is only as being the Only Begotten that he could become the First Begotten, and thus the First born among many brethren. And so in the surviving and unextinguished wrecks of that original Sonship in man is found the basis for rearing the structure of his new Christian Sonship. It is one who appears not "less than Archangel ruined" that Christ comes to clothe with more than his "original brightness." But we must still think that the common Sonship and the mutual brotherhood of our passage lie within the sphere of redemption, and that the explanation is found in the pregnant language of Rom. 8: "Whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son" (that is, to be brought with him into a common relation of Sonship) "that he might be a first-born among many brethren." But the argument is not finished. These sons of God and brethren of Christ must bear his nature, or, rather, he must bear theirs. As he has undertaken to make them his brethren, to all which that relation implies he must condescend, and all which that relation *demands* he must fulfill.

14. Forasmuch (or, *since*) **then the children**—children of God and brethren of Christ: but he here adopts the term from the last verse, and dwells upon it with a tender sense of the ideas of dependence and affection which cluster

[1] The superficial difficulties attending the alleged Messianic citations in the New Testament from the Old, vanish on a deeper investigation. The case, in fact, becomes reversed, and the unsolvable difficulties are found to attend the *non*-Messianic interpretation. Deny this, and the whole Old Testament becomes an inexplicable enigma. The whole significance of the Old Dispensation is its foreshadowing of, and preparation for, the New. Its whole history is a history of the preliminary stages of redemption; its whole structure a grand forecourt to the still grander Christian temple. Abraham was chosen to be the founder of the Seed, in whom all the nations should be blessed; his descendants were set apart as the birth-nation of the Messiah; all its institutions were organized on this basis, and the whole history typified that of the spiritual Israel. Bearing this in mind, we cannot be surprised or stumbled that under the clearer lights of the New Testament the pregnant hints of the Old take a new and unexpected meaning; and to find the Spirit of inspiration, interpreting his own words and symbols into a clearer development of Christ. The author of our Epistle, too, was addressing Jews—and Jews who, though Christians, were still held more or less under the traditionary trammels of the synagogue. We cannot, then, doubt that his interpretations would be scrutinized with jealous rigor, and that they must, therefore, as to their general Christological character, have coincided with its prevalent views; and there is no so rational mode of accounting for the prevalence of these views among the earlier Jews as to suppose that they were founded in truth. Their difference from the apostle's was not as to their application to Christ, but their application to Jesus.

14 Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil;

14 me. Since then the children are sharers in [1] flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner partook of the same; that through death he [2] might bring to nought him who [3] had the power of death, that is

1 Gr. *blood and flesh*.....2 Or, *may*.....3 Or, *hath*.

about the term (τὰ παιδία, *the little children*)—**are partakers of flesh and blood** (Greek, *blood and flesh*), **he also himself likewise took part of the same.** Here the *prolleptic* character of the previous argument fully comes out. Because the children—that is, *those who were to be* children—were mortal, therefore Christ became mortal; because *those who were to be* his brethren were in the flesh, therefore he became flesh. The argument, apparently faulty, is simply so from the brevity of the statement. Christ saw in these future heirs of salvation brethren and children of God, and hastened to put himself into the position which would enable him to realize this ideal picture. Its touching beauty lies in the fact that the author disguises, holds in the background, the depraved, guilty, rebellious character of the objects of redemption. Jesus dies not for apostates, but for sons; not for aliens, but for brethren. His compassionate love already invests them with the character to which it is eventually to bring them. There is a double logic—that of the head and that of the heart; that of fact and that of feeling. The one sees in men enemies whom Christ intends to convert into friends, children, brethren, and for whom he therefore assumes human nature; the other sees in men by anticipation, brethren, children, friends, and for whom, therefore, because they are human, he assumes human nature. In the one case, he dies for them as they are; in the other case, he dies for them as they are to be.[1] *In order* **that through death he might destroy** (*bring to nought*) **him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.** In harmony with the tender strain of the preceding verses is the representation here. It is not the *guilt* of humanity that the compassionate Saviour sees, but its *wretchedness*. He takes flesh and blood, not to reclaim rebels and reconcile enemies, but to ransom brethren who were in bondage to death and its terrors. We need not say that each point of view has equally its truth, and that the gospel equally contemplates both—man's depravity, and his ruin; his wickedness, and his weakness; the criminality which has subjected him to death, and the death under whose burden and curse he groans. And, indeed, the *hereditary* character of the curse of humanity, the fact that death reigns "even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression" (Rom. 6:14); the fact that sin is not, as in the case of the devils, purely individual, but a matter of birth and race, renders eminently natural and proper the second point of view, and creates a presumption that God intended to provide a deliverer to open a fountain of cleansing and life, whose streams should run alongside those of pollution and death. It is as a victim of death that man is here regarded; as the subject of the penalty which was denounced upon his transgression in Eden. All that is involved in this death—the ruin of the soul, as well as the dissolution of the body—is, of course, retrieved in the deliverance. But the idea is conceived more concretely. Man is a slave, not to death, but to the devil, who has the power of death, and who, through and in death, holds dominion over the race. Satan has the power of death—not, indeed, absolutely; for absolute dominion belongs only to God, but as having originally, by his subtle arts, brought it into the world—being a homicide, a murderer from the beginning—and still, as "the god of this world," struggling to perpetuate his disastrous sovereignty. The writer, however, intends no nice distinction. The expression is figurative and far-reaching. It simply conceives Satan as monarch in the realm of death, originating, controlling it, and through it wielding his tyrannical sceptre over man. To destroy the monarch of death, then, is to destroy death; to destroy death is to destroy its monarch (καταργεῖν, a word rare in the classics, but common in the New Testament.

[1] The Greek verb translated 'are partakers,' is in the perfect tense (κεκοινώνηκεν), meaning, *have had, and still have part in*, and denotes, properly, those whose permanent and normal condition is that of being in the flesh; the aorist μετέσχεν, 'took part of,' or *partook*, denotes the act of entering into and putting on humanity. Παραπλησίως, *in like manner*, or, *similarly* is used elegantly for ὁμοίως.

15 And deliver them, who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.
16 For verily he took not on *him the nature of* angels; but he took on *him* the seed of Abraham.

15 the devil; and [1] might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bond-
16 age. [2] For verily not to angels doth he give help, but

1 Or, *may*.....2 Or, *For verily not of angels doth he take hold, but he taketh hold of.*

render inoperative—hence, *nullify, overthrow, destroy.* (1 Cor. 15 : 24.) "When he shall have *annihilated* (Common Version, *put down*) all rule and all authority and power." It is used specifically of abolishing death. (1 Cor. 15 : 26; 2 Tim. 1 : 10.) The destruction of Satan, the lord of death, Christ accomplishes *through death*—not simply by *his* death, but by *death*, taken abstractly and absolutely; by turning the enginery which Satan wields, the forces of his kingdom against himself, and making death itself the instrument of the destruction of its lord. *How* the death of Christ accomplishes this it is not here our province to discuss. His death may be regarded in several aspects, each, no doubt, essential to a just estimate of it. In one most obvious aspect, it appears as a triumphant resistance to the *temptations* of Satan. In the beginning of our Lord's ministry, the tempter had concentrated upon him in vain his arts of seduction. He returned, at its close, with tenfold and desperate malice, and in the garden and on the cross exhausted on him his hellish fury. Jesus maintained his integrity, drank resolutely the cup which was commended to his lips, wrestled with the Potentate of death, and, even in dying, achieved a victory. Thus, as Representative Man, he triumphed over him to whom the first representative man had succumbed. Adam, in possession of life, yielded to temptation, and incurred death; Jesus, bound to death, resisted the temptation to avoid it, and in facing and enduring it, procured life both for himself and his people. Yet, more than this, our Lord's death was a strictly *expiatory sacrifice* for human guilt. His resistance of the devil was not the expiation itself, but was its indispensable condition. If the victim had not been perfect the sacrifice would have been without efficacy. He must first struggle with Satan in life; he must then struggle with Satan in death, and, as it were, with death itself; and by dying in and through holy obedience, as Adam had died in and through transgression and guilt, wrest the sting from death, and lift its curse from the soul of humanity. The destruction of death, I may add, was to be the grand feature of the Messianic era. (Isa. 25 : 8; Hosea 13 : 14.) Christ accomplishes this work — first, by delivering his people from the fear of death, and destroying within them that principle of sin which is its cause and sting; and, finally, by annihilating all its effects in the resurrection of the body. (1 Cor. 15.)

15. And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. 'Them who.' *These persons whosoever*, or, *as many as.* The phrase designates the class to whom the redemption is applicable. It at once limits the class, and declares its universality within the sphere of that class. It restricts the redemption to man, and declares—as above (ver. 9), 'for every man,' or, *on behalf of every one*—the applicability of redemption to the entire race. Not that it teaches the actual salvation of all, any more than John 1 : 9, "The light that lighteneth every man that cometh into the world," or John 12 : 32, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." The passage thus marks a peculiar and striking characteristic of humanity. As alone possessing body and soul, man alone is liable to death; and thus liable and having sinned, he groans under its perpetual dread, is in bondage to its terrors, and to the tyrant who sways its sceptre. Death is the great dread and terror of the race. Even the saints of the Old Testament stood in fear of the darkness and gloom of the grave. Hades, with his deep and dismal recesses, his silence, solitude, and corruption, they regarded with shuddering. Contrast the prayer of Hezekiah and many of the psalms with the joyous and triumphant tones of the New Testament regarding death. To the apostle, "to die is gain." He longs to be absent from the body, and at home with the Lord. He sees a house not made with hands, an undecaying, heavenly, eternal habitation, replacing the transient tabernacle of flesh.

16. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, etc., or, *For it is not,*

17 Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto *his* brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things *pertaining* to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.

17 he giveth help to the seed of Abraham. Wherefore it beboved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to

doubtless,[1] *angels whom he rescueth, but he rescueth the seed of Abraham.* The once widely received, but now exploded, rendering, "taketh not on him the nature of angels," makes the sentence little better than a tautological platitude. The author has said that the Redeemer took part in the flesh and blood that are shared by the children. It is no advance on the thought to say that he took not on him the nature of angels; but it is a decided advance in the thought to say, in accounting for his assuming flesh and blood, that he was not coming to the rescue of angels, who possess not bodies, and are not subjects of death. The verb in this sentence (ἐπιλαμβάνεται) may be translated *layeth hold upon.* The force of the preposition *upon* (ἐπί) goes over to the person laid hold of. It is not "takes *upon* himself," but, "lays hold *upon another*" for rescue or relief, as in 8 : 9, "in the day when I took them by the hand," or, *laid hold of them.* The present tense either marks the act conceived as abiding, or is put spiritedly for the past. 'The seed of Abraham.' Not that the apostle intends to restrict the redemption to the Jews, in denial of the broader destination of the gospel; but the Epistle, in its practical scope, expressly designed for Hebrews, keeps here, as elsewhere, the Hebrew point of view. It is doubtful, perhaps, whether 'the seed of Abraham' denotes, here, Abraham's spiritual offspring,—the spiritual Israel—or rather, as I think, 'the seed of Abraham' as the predestined centre and source of salvation to the world. In Abraham's seed all the nations of the earth were to be blessed; and, therefore, in coming to the rescue of the seed of Abraham, Christ comes to the rescue of entire humanity. It stands as the representative of the race. The 'seed of Abraham' is not placed in contrast to the rest of the race of men, but to angels.

17. Wherefore . . . it behooved him— (*whence he was bound by the work of deliverance which he had undertaken:* it was what he *owed* to the nature of the enterprise) **in all things . . . to be made like unto his brethren.** 'In all things,' and, therefore, in the assumption of flesh and blood. The reasoning is elliptical. Its exact import is: Whence, *as* he was bound in all things to be assimilated to his brethren, therefore he must take human nature, with all its infirmities, including liability to temptation and death. The preceding idea of the incarnation and death is broadened by the 'all things' (κατὰ πάντα), so as to open the way for the idea—not merely of a complete and perfect Saviour in his death, but of a perfect, living High Priest. **That he might be** (*become*) **a merciful** (*compassionate*) **and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God.** The term 'become' applies not only to Christ's becoming a high priest (and, as such, compassionate and faithful), but also a *compassionate* High Priest; because, although he was previously compassionate—and, in fact, his compassion dictated his incarnation and his *becoming* a High Priest—yet we might say that the *divine* compassion evinced in originating the plan of redemption differs from the *human* compassion requisite to the priestly intercession of the glorified Jews. The writer conceives sympathy and compassion as requisite qualities of a high priesthood; and these could be possessed only by a high priest taken from among men, and who shared, or had shared, the frailties and sufferings of humanity. Hence, merciful as Christ may have been before, the peculiar form of tenderness here conceived could spring only through his incarnation. It is the compassion of the sympathizing High Priest, not the mercy of the spiritual God. The position of the original words is peculiar. It is such as to show that while the epithet 'merciful' looks back, and is an inference from the preceding, 'faithful' is an additional thought looking forward to the immediately following discussion. Such is one of the characteristics of the style of this Epistle. While reviewing, and, as it were, gathering up the results of a preceding discussion, it introduces, as if accidentally, what serves as a transition

[1] Δή που, "you know, I suppose," "doubtless," appeals to a well-known fact, and is a particle at once of emphasis, vivacity, and modesty; the πού, *perhaps, I suppose*, softening the force of the δή; not implying doubt, but removing the appearance of dogmatism. It is in no way represented by "verily."

18 For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.

18 make propitiation for the sins of the people. [1]For [2]in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.

1 Gr. *For having been himself tempted in that wherein he hath suffered*.....2 Or, *wherein*.

to that which follows, and makes the parts of the discourse, as it were, *gripe* into each other. 'Faithful' (πιστός), not here merely 'worthy of confidence,' 'reliable'—but rather, actively faithful, evincing fidelity. The term 'in things pertaining to God' refers not merely to the term High Priest, but to the whole sentence, "that he might become, in things pertaining to God, a merciful and faithful High Priest." **To make reconciliation** (*propitiation*) **for the sins of the people.** To make propitiation for (ἱλάσκεσθαι), and hence, as means of propitiation, *to expiate, atone for.* (In classical use with the accusative, *to propitiate a person.*) 'The people,' used in conformity with the limited phrase, 'seed of Abraham,' as applicable, properly, to the Jewish people, but to them as representatives of the world for whom the expiation was equally made. Christ came as the Deliverer of Israel, but, in Israel, as the Deliverer of the world. He died to expiate the sins of the people, but, in the people, the sins of the world. The introduction of the high priesthood of Christ, at the close of this discussion of his superiority to the angels, as also of that of his superiority to Moses, has its evident purpose. It brings forward from time to time, and keeps under the reader's eye, that which was to be the central theme of the Epistle, as it was the vital feature of the New Dispensation, the intercessory high priesthood of Christ, a high priesthood commencing in his offering of himself as a spotless sin-offering to God, and consummated in his entrance, with his own blood, into the heavenly Holy of holies, there to appear in the presence of God for us.

18. **For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.** The passage admits of various constructions, which, in the main, but slightly modify the sense. 'In that,' or, *wherein*, render well the Greek (ἐν ᾧ). The ideas are not very widely apart, as the one ('wherein') circumscribes his power to succor within the sphere of his experience of temptation and suffering; and the other ('in that') makes his power to succor *dependent* on that experience. The difference is but slight. Again, the first clause may be rendered (with Delitzsch), "For after being himself tempted in that he has suffered, or in his experience of suffering"; or (as Lünemann and Moll), "For in that he has suffered, being himself tempted"; or, as seems to me more natural, 'For in that he has himself suffered, being tempted, he is able,' etc. The rendering of Delitzsch makes a broader distinction between the 'suffering' and the 'temptation' than do the others, and throws greater stress on the temptation *apart from* the suffering. In this I think he errs. The suffering and the temptation seem to me to have each stood prominent in the author's mind; or, rather, I think it is only at the very close of this verse that the idea of suffering gradually passes over into that of temptation. True, again, the clause can be read, 'For in that he has suffered, *after* being himself tempted,' thus making the temptation distinctly precede the suffering, instead of being coincident with it, and mainly constituting it; but this, too, seems to me less probable. 'He is able' (δύναται) refers simply to his moral capacity, produced by his personal experience of suffering. 'Them that are tempted'—his human brethren, who are always in the condition of being subject to temptation.

---

2. CHRIST SUPERIOR TO MOSES.

Having delineated the superiority of Christ to the angels, the ministerial revealers of the Old Testament, the author proceeds to show his superiority, as founder of the New Dispensation, to Moses, the earthly founder of the Old. Next follows an extended warning and exhortation founded on this comparison. Then he shows that the rest of God, forfeited by ancient Israel, is still open, in a higher form, to the spiritual Israel. Lastly follows exhortation to heed the word of God, and transition to the high priesthood, the chief topic of the Epistle.

Ch. 3. (1) *Christ, as Leader of the New Testament Israel and Founder of the New Testament house of God, greater than Moses, leader of ancient Israel, and founder of the Old Testament house of God.* (1–6.)

CHAPTER III

WHEREFORE, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus;

1 Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of a heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our

1. Wherefore (ὅθεν, *whence*, a favorite particle of inference with the author, and by him always—except, perhaps, 11 : 19—used logically, not locally)—that is, in consideration of the qualities thus found in Christ, his personal greatness and his admirable fitness as a Saviour. **Holy brethren.** 'Holy,' an epithet given here, perhaps, with reference to the idea (2 : 11) of Christ, as Sanctifier, making holy (ἁγιάζων), and his people the sanctified (ἁγιαζόμενοι). It also, however, grows out of the whole topic of the redemption and priestly work of Christ. It is not so much a term of individual character as of general relation, marking the characteristic of the children of God as such. In their general relation to Christ they are all 'holy' (ἅγιοι, *sacred, saints*), while having attained actual personal sanctification in very different degrees. The term 'brethren,' too, we can hardly help feeling to have here an especial significance. While they are 'brethren' immediately in their relation to the writer and to each other, the author yet seems lingering over the term so expressive of the tender relation between the sons and the Son, the redeemed and their Redeemer. The 'holy brethren,' then, is the gathering up and the echo of all that deeply touching strain in which the author has portrayed the humiliation and the redeeming sufferings of Christ. The combination, I believe, is found only here. **Partakers of the** (*a*) **heavenly calling.** As 'holy brethren' indicates the relation of believers to Christ, as Redeemer and Sanctifier, so 'partakers of a heavenly calling' refers to their relation to him as the heavenly-commissioned One, sent forth to 'call' (καλεῖν) men into his kingdom. As God's Ambassador, or Apostle,[1] he comes to call men to salvation; as incarnate Redeemer and High Priest, he sanctifies and saves them. The calling is doubly 'heavenly'—alike in its origin and destination. They are called from heaven and to heaven by One who descended from heaven to conduct them thither. As such, he exhorts them: **Consider**—or, *Contemplate* (κατανοήσατε, *fix your mind upon*, give careful heed to, treat not with indifference or neglect.) As (2 : 1) he exhorts his readers to heed the *revelations* of this Great Messenger, so now, in like manner, to heed the Messenger himself. The exhortation is no merely formal one. His readers have indicated a disposition to turn away from, and treat with indifference this great Saviour. He solemnly and impressively warns them against it, and calls them back to a steadfast contemplation of his claims. **The Apostle and High Priest of our profession** (*confession*), **Christ Jesus.** The two predicates here applied to Jesus answer *chiastically* (Delitzsch) to the two designations just given to his Christian readers. In reversed order, as 'partakers of a heavenly calling,' they are to give heed to the heavenly Messenger (ἀπόστολος), who was sent forth commissioned (ἀπεσταλμένος) to bring that calling, with all its consequences; as 'holy brethren' they are to give heed to the High Priest, who, by his sacrifice and mediation, cleansed their sins and made them sons of God. The two grand characteristics in Christ's character and work as Saviour, are, in the two epithets, pregnantly designated; his descent from heaven as God's Ambassador of salvation; his reascent to heaven as man's interceding High Priest. In the one feature he is the divine and divinely commissioned organ of the New Revelation; in the other, he is the true high-priestly Sacrifice, and Intercessor before God. In the one character, he announces salvation; in the other, he accomplishes it. The words '*of our confession*' belong to both epithets, 'Apostle' and 'High Priest.' Jesus is the Apostle and High Priest whom *we* confess or acknowledge. We see, finally, that in the designations applied to Christians and the designations applied to Christ, all the grand ideas of the two preceding chapters are pregnantly summed up. The author is prepared to turn to another aspect of the Redeemer's

[1] Ἀπόστολος, *commissioned one*, rather than ἄγγελος, *messenger*, because this term has just been distinctively appropriated to an inferior class of beings, and also, perhaps, with reference to that office which had become consecrated under the New Dispensation. The Old Testament had its *messengers*, ἄγγελοι; the New has its *apostles*, ἀπόστολοι.

2 Who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also Moses *was faithful* in all his house.

2 confession, *even* Jesus; who was faithful to him that [1] appointed him, as also was Moses in all [2] his house.

1 Gr. *made*.....2 That is, *God's house*. See Num. xii. 7.

character, already prepared for by the 'faithful' (πιστός) just above.

2. Who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house. After comparing Christ with the angels, the revealers of the law, and showing the reason of his temporary humiliation below them, that he might redeem a people and found a church of God, it is natural that he should next compare him, as the Founder of that church, with Moses, the deliverer and organizer of the ancient theocratic community. Moses and Aaron were, respectively, the apostle, or commissioned one, and the high priest, of the Israelitish confession. The people "were baptized to Moses" in the Red Sea; he was their great lawgiver and prophet; he gave them the law, and in him they trusted (John 5:45); they styled themselves, specially, his disciples (John 9:29); they gloried in their political relation to him, as in their lineal descent from Abraham. It is, hence, not arbitrary, but natural, that Christ should next be put in contrast with Moses; the apostle of *our* confession with the apostle of the confession of ancient Israel. 'Who was faithful' (τὸν ὄντα πιστόν). The phrase is predicative, *as being faithful, as one who was faithful;* and the *being* (ὄντα) by no means (as Bleek) marks, necessarily, the time now present to the writer, and thus points to Christ's present fidelity as High Priest in God's heavenly house, but simply the time indicated by the connection which, as shown by the word 'Jesus,' and by the whole train of thought, is that of our Lord's sojourn on earth. Here he came as God's 'apostle,' ambassador, to proclaim salvation, to call out his people from the spiritual Egypt, and, by his appointment and his obedience to his will, to found a new theocracy, to inaugurate a spiritual kingdom, to rear a spiritual house, over against the national theocracy, the temporal kingdom, the ritual household of ancient Israel. To this work God **appointed** (*made*, ποιήσας) him, as he appointed Moses to the founding of the old theocracy.[1] The author (as conjectured by Bleek, followed by Delitzsch) has probably in mind 1 Sam. 12:6, "The Lord that made (that is, *appointed*, ποιήσας) Moses and Aaron" (compare ver. 8), "sent (*forth*, ἀπέστειλε) Moses and Aaron." He then recurs to Num. 12:7, which was probably in his mind when he used the word 'faithful,' and which again may have suggested the passage from Samuel, and adds, **as also Moses** (*was faithful*) **in all his house.** Some interpreters put a comma after "Moses," and refer the words, "in all his house," to Christ, which the language of Numbers scarcely favors. It reads, "My servant Moses is not so, whom I have found faithful in all mine house." The citation, too, shows that the "his" refers not to Moses, but to God. The elliptical passage, then, institutes a comparison between Jesus and Moses, in their relation to the house or household over which God had respectively appointed them. The relation is, thus far, one of equality. Moses had been faithful in all God's house: so Jesus was faithful in all God's house. It is important to determine whether it is one house or two of which the author speaks, and in or over which Moses and Jesus were both faithful. Most interpreters, misled, I think, by the elliptical language, have confounded the two houses into one, to the serious darkening of the passage. The houses, it seems to me, were certainly two—Moses led out the people of God from the temporal, Christ from the spiritual, Egypt. Moses was God's ancient apostle to Israel, of temporal salvation; Christ his recent Apostle of spiritual salvation. Moses founded, by God's express appointment, the ancient household of Israel, with its laws, ritual, and ministry; Christ founded, by like divine appointment, the household of the spiritual

[1] The admissibleness of taking ποιεῖν, *make*, used absolutely, without a second accusative, as *appoint, constitute*, is questioned by many. They refer it, therefore, either to God's making, producing of the Son, in his eternal generation (as Bleek, Lünemann), or (as Athanasius, Ambrose, and Kurtz) to his human birth in his incarnation. Delitzsch applies it to a figurative creation, or constituting, on the stage of history. Many of the interpreters—taking it in the sense of appointing, establishing—have supplied a word (as ἀπόστολον, apostle) after ποιήσας. On the whole, I think we must leave it doubtful between 'making him, 'giving him his incarnate life,' and 'appointing' him.

3 For this *man* was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honour than the house.

3 For he hath been counted worthy of more glory than Moses, by so much as he that [1] built the house hath 4 more honour than the house. For every house is

1 Or, *established.*

Israel, with its laws, rites, and ministry. Each household thus founded by command of God was a house of God. Moses was faithful in all God's house, in or over which he was appointed; Christ, in like manner, in and over all God's New Testament house. I do not see how we can reasonably doubt that the reference is to two houses, and not to one; and that the comparison is between two divinely appointed earthly founders, each of his respective house. The name 'Jesus,' the words 'that appointed him,' the words 'whose house are we' (marking a new spiritual house), show the nature of the parallel. It is run between Moses and the incarnate Jesus; and any reference to the Eternal Logos, as founding "the church in the wilderness," in which Moses was a servant, is out of the question. Christ, as the Eternal Logos, was, doubtless, the God of Sinai and the Jewish Theocracy, as he was the Word of the Creation; but that is here out of the scope of the writer. He is considering not the Logos of the Old Testament, but the Jesus, the Incarnate Word of the New, and, in this relation, comparing him with Moses. In the first place, he is throughout bringing the New Dispensation alongside of the Old; Jesus, the Bringer of salvation alongside of the angels; Jesus, the New Testament High Priest, alongside of Aaron; and, therefore, assuredly Jesus, the Founder of the New Testament church, alongside of the Old Testament theocracy. To this points the name 'Jesus' that ushers in the comparison; to this the 'being faithful,' which can only refer to Jesus in his humiliation (his fidelity as pre-incarnate Logos could never come into question); to this the word *made* (ποιήσας, whether understood as *appointed* or *produced*), for of the *appointment* of the pre-existent Logos we have no trace; and, finally, to this, the house (ver. 6) which Jesus founded, a spiritual edifice of actual believers. In these two houses, they were alike faithful. Thus far the similarity and apparent equality; but afterward, the real difference, that Moses, though seemingly a head, was, in reality, but a servant, and Christ, though temporarily a servant, was, in reality, a Head, and sustained a like relation to Moses as does the head and founder to the household; which does not at all require that they be in the same household.

3. For—either explicative (as De Wette), or unfolding the last thought of the preceding verse, or better, perhaps, referring back to "consider" (ver. 1), and finding a ground for that—**this man** (*this personage*) **was** (*has been*) **counted worthy of more glory than Moses.** Not, as some, the glory which overspread the face of Moses when he descended from the mount, though we, perhaps, can scarcely avoid assuming a covert comparison between the glory which transfigured the face of Moses on Sinai, and the glory which wrapt the whole person of Jesus (in the presence of Moses) on Mount Hermon. It is safe, however, and amply sufficient, to refer it to the immeasurably higher exaltation in dignity and glory of the Founder of the New Covenant, advanced to supreme dominion, than was accorded to the founder of the Old. **Inasmuch** (*as much*) **as he who hath builded the house,** etc. (*By how much more honor than the house hath he that founded it*). From this it has been hastily concluded that Moses was the house, and Christ the Founder of the house of which Moses was the subordinate head; that Christ, therefore, appears as the Eternal Logos, and as such infinitely superior to Moses. But this mistakes the entire purpose of the author, who is comparing Moses and Jesus each in the earthly sphere in which God had placed him. In this sphere they first appear on an equality, each faithful in his allotted province. But the author now states, *in general terms*, the difference. Equal, apparently, there existed between them, in reality, the disparity which exists between a household and its founder and head. It by no means follows that they were in, or over, the same house; but that belonging to different houses, and sustaining the same, or a like, relation to each, at once of subordination and headship, there was, in reality, the utmost conceivable interval between them. How this could be is immediately stated.

4 For every house is builded by some *man;* but he that built all things *is* God.
5 And Moses verily *was* faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after;
6 But Christ as a son over his own house; whose

[1] builded by some one; but he who [1] built all things is God. 5 And Moses indeed was faithful in all [2] his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things 6 which were afterward to be spoken; but Christ as a son, over [2] his house; whose house are we, if we hold

1 Or, *established*.....2 That is, *God's house.* See Num. xii. 7.

4. For every house is builded (*established, founded*) **by some man** (*one*)**; but he that built** (*established*) **all things is God.** These statements remind the reader that both the New Testament and the Old Testament houses must have had an immediate, subordinate, apparent founder, as, respectively, Moses and Jesus; and one ultimate and Supreme Founder, to whom both were responsible, and toward whom fidelity could be predicated of them; namely, God. There is, then, in regard to both of the houses, a double founding—one instrumental and subordinate, the other absolute and supreme. So Moses established, instrumentally, the theocracy, the house of God, in the wilderness; but God established it supremely. So Jesus organized the New Testament theocracy, the more spiritual house of God, the church of believers; but this, again, is not *his* house—it is the house of God. God's prerogative of being the *Universal* Founder, is no more intermitted in the case of Jesus than of Moses. Almost uniformly in the New Testament, we read of the church, the house, the people, the sons—not of Christ, but of God. And to both the fidelity and the glory we have striking testimony, "I have finished the work *which thou gavest me to do;* and now, O Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." (John 17:4, 5.) And while it is thus shown how there could be in each case a twofold founder; how Moses and Jesus could be both at the head of their respective houses, and yet both be subordinate and both faithful; it also opens the way for affirming the above alleged inequality, in that one can be finally identified with God, the Absolute Founder, and the other *remains* a merely instrumental founder, and sinks, really, into the organization of which he is apparently the head. With this preparation, the author proceeds to draw out sharply the difference hinted at in ver. 3, and shown to be possible in ver. 4.

5, 6. And Moses verily (rather, *indeed*) **was faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after; but Christ as a Son over his own** (*his*) **house.** Each had founded a house subordinately, of which the Absolute Founder, and, therefore, the Supreme Possessor, was God. What, then, was the difference? It was one lying in the intrinsic nature of the two personages. The subordination of Moses to the Supreme Founder had been absolute, as well as apparent. Christ had founded his house in real subordination, but also in essential equality; Moses had organized the Old Testament theocracy both apparently and really as a servant. Christ had instituted the New Testament church apparently as a servant, but really as a Son. Moses, therefore, elevated as he was, chosen leader and head of ancient Israel, into whose allegiance they had undergone the profound baptism of the Red Sea, was, after all, but *in* the house of God, and *a part of it.* Christ, although sunk to the depths of humiliation, was, after all, *over* the house of God, and its real Head. Moses, apparent founder and head of the house, was but a part of the household; Christ, apparently a Servant of the servants, rises, as the Son of God into equality with the Founder, and becomes, in the last analysis, supreme, as well as subordinate, heavenly, as well as earthly, divine as well as human, Builder of the New Testament house. He has as much higher honor than Moses as the Founder of the house has more honor than the house. The seeming paradox is explained by the double nature of the Wondrous Personage; he is at once Moses' equal and Moses' head, as he was David's Son and David's Lord. We have yet another point of contrast. Moses was in a carnal, typical house; Christ was over a living and spiritual one. Moses was faithful as 'a testimony of those things which should be spoken,' not (as, superficially, Bleek, De Wette, Lünemann) of the things to be spoken to him, the commands to be given him regarding the regulations of the Theocracy, but of the things which were to be spoken in a future time—the New Testament revelation by Christ. Thus Moses' position was merely

house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end.

fast our boldness and the glorying of our hope firm

typical and preparatory—he had the shadow of which Christ brought the substance; he, like John, merely bore testimony to the great truths afterward to be uttered. The real house of God, adds the writer, **are we, if,** etc., Christian believers, the sons of God by a new and spiritual birth—these are the true house of God, living stones built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ as the chief corner stone, the whole a spiritual house, growing up into a holy temple in the Lord. So (with Ebrard and Delitzsch) I understand the two last clauses as setting over against each other the typical institutions of Moses and the spiritual church of Christ. The points of contrast, then, between Moses and Christ, are these: (1) Moses founded the house of God subordinately as a servant; Christ founded it supremely as a Son. (2) Moses was *in* it and a part of it; Christ was *over* it as its Lord. (3) Moses founded a typical house, and held a merely preparatory relation; Christ founded the true spiritual house of regenerate believers. He might have added a fourth—that Moses was imperfect in his obedience and fidelity; while Jesus, as a mere human messenger working out his Father's will, was absolute in perfection. But this the writer cared not to press. He was dealing not with the accidental, but the inherent and necessary differences between Christ and Moses; not those which depended on different degrees of fidelity, but those which no amount of fidelity in Moses could have obliterated. Moreover, while exhibiting the inferiority of Moses, he yet shows no disposition to disparage him. He deals with him tenderly and lovingly. He calls him not a *slave* (δοῦλος), or, *a household servant* (οἰκέτης), hereditary or purchased, but a *voluntary, willing attendant on another* (θεράπων). The elliptical clause, 'But Christ as a Son over his house,' is variously filled up. By some (Bleek, De Wette), 'But Christ (is faithful) as a Son over his house' (is faithful): but, as most clearly, 'his' refers to God—over God's house—this construction is inadmissible. Others construct: But Christ (is faithful) as a Son over his house; or, But Christ, as a Son (is faithful), over his house. Others (as Delitzsch, Moll), But Christ, as a Son, is *over* his house—the idea of fidelity at first suggested by his lowly position as an earthly Founder now giving place to that of *authority* as a Son in view of his higher nature. I see no ground of deciding positively between them. Either answers all the purposes of the argument.

Our explanation assumes that the house of God is not here spoken of as continuous, but as twofold. The New Testament people of God are certainly the people of God in historical continuity with the Old. The church of Mount Zion (12:22) is, in a limited sense, identical with the congregation at the foot of Mount Sinai; and the undeveloped institution of Judaism may be conceived as having blossomed forth into the full flower of Christianity; yet, in a truer and deeper sense, these households and people are widely different, and the difference was manifest when Judaism persecuted Christianity, and had to be broken up and swept out of the way before Christianity could triumph. Here it suits the author's purpose to bring out the difference; as before he contrasted the revelations made respectively through the Son and through angels, so now, the two households organized respectively by the Son and by Moses. **Whose house are we,** etc.—rather, *We are, if we maintain the boldness and the glorying*[1] *of our hope, firm unto the end.* 'Whose house'—that is, God's house, not Christ's. 'We' stands representatively here for all believers, yet intended to point his readers to their own special prerogative above their ancestors. *They*, he tells them, are that house—of course, part of that house—which this greater than Moses, this Son of God, founded and presides over—the true spiritual house in antithesis to the typical one founded by Moses, disciples of him of whom Moses was but a witness. But the writer adds a condition. New Testament believers are this spiritual house—'we,' as such, are part of it, on condition that we *prove* ourselves believers; that we establish our claim by maintaining our fidelity to the

[1] Παρρησία, *boldness, assurance, assured confidence*; καύχημα, *glorying, exultation*—not καύχησις, the *act*, but rather its result or object.

7 Wherefore as the Holy Ghost saith, To day if ye will hear his voice,

7 unto the end. Wherefore, even as the Holy Spirit saith,
To-day if ye shall hear his voice,

end. The wavering condition of his readers prompts this sudden turn, while the language is suggested by the context. Ancient Israel showed itself not to be the true house of God; those who escaped from Egypt through Moses did not remain steadfast. The boldness and exultant hope with which they commenced their pilgrimage gave way; they became faint-hearted and cowardly, feared the giants in the land, and murmured against God until his patience was exhausted; and he sware, in his wrath, that they should not enter Canaan. See Numbers, ch. 14; Deuteronomy, ch. 1. It was precisely in connection with these faint-hearted terrors that God excluded his ancient people from their inheritance, and to this may be the present reference. The terms, of course, are raised to their higher spiritual meaning.

(2) *Solemn warning to the readers against repeating the rebellion of their fathers and excluding themselves from God's Sabbatic rest, as the rebels under Moses forfeited the rest of Canaan.* (7–19.)

7. This brief but decisive statement of the superiority of Christ to Moses is followed by a practical warning similar to that deduced from his superiority to the angels. The law revealed through them was held valid, and all disobedience and neglect sorely punished. How much more, neglect of the salvation revealed through Christ! So the people who had been baptized into allegiance to Moses, and organized by him into a household of God, a theocratic community, had, from their refusal to hearken to him, failed of the promised rest, and perished in the wilderness. How much more dangerous, disobedience to our greater Head, who is conducting us to the true rest of God! Such the substance; but the *form* of the exhortation is determined by a long and apposite quotation from the Psalms, which introduces some most pertinent thoughts, and is allowed to control the drift of the entire passage. **Wherefore.** With this we may suppose the writer was going on—as ch. 2 : 1 seq.—to admonish his readers of the terrible consequences of refusing to obey this greater than Moses; but the language of the Psalm occurs to him, and his warning conforms itself to it, including, however, all the substance of that thought. **As the Holy Ghost saith,** etc.—*according as saith the Holy Spirit, to-day, if ye shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts.* The long citation (ver. 7-13) is from Ps. 95 : 7–11, in which the Psalmist of the time of David warns the Israelites against repeating the transgressions of their fathers in the wilderness. Of course, it is equally apposite to the purpose of our author, as applicable now as then. The first question is as to the mode of completing the construction. There have been suggested: (1) 'Wherefore, as saith the Holy Spirit, to-day . . . Take heed'—*See to it* (βλέπετε, ver. 12), the answering clause to 'wherefore,' *according as* (διό, καθώς) being found in 'See to it' (βλέπετε). (2) 'Wherefore (as saith the Holy Spirit) to-day, if ye hear,' etc., 'harden not,' etc., the author thus adopting the Holy Spirit's, or the Psalmist's, exhortation as his own. (3) 'Wherefore (act, or be admonished), according as saith the Holy Spirit,' the sentence being completed by assuming and supplying an ellipsis at the outset. To neither of these constructions can I see any insuperable objection. The objection to the first, from the long *interval* between the 'according as' (καθώς) and the answering clause, 'See to it' (βλέπετε), has weight, doubtless, but is by no means decisive. A stronger objection, perhaps, is the use of 'according as' (καθώς) when we should expect 'as' (ὡς); and the abruptness of the whole construction makes it, on the whole, improbable. An objection to the second is that, as a large part of the quotation is the language of God himself, the author could hardly give it in his own name. To this we might reply that the author guards his language by introducing it with "as the Holy Spirit saith"; and, secondly, that he merely follows the changes of the Psalmist, who, beginning with an exhortation in his own name—"if ye hear his voice"—imperceptibly slides over to the language of Jehovah. To the third construction I know no valid objection, as the ellipsis is sufficiently in accordance with the usages of language, and especially of the flexible Greek; and between this and the second I see no decisive ground of choice. I incline to the third, under the belief that the language, 'as the Holy Spirit saith.'

8 Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness:	8 Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation,
9 When your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works forty years.	Like as in the day of the trial in the wilderness,
10 Wherefore I was grieved with that generation, and	9 [1] Where your fathers tried *me* by proving *me*,
	And saw my works forty years.
	10 Wherefore I was displeased with this generation,

1 Or, *Wherewith.*

indicates that what follows is a simple quotation, and, therefore, that the author's adoption of it must be previously understood. [The first construction is adopted by Calvin, Bleek, Lünemann; the second by Ebrard, Delitzsch; the third by Tholuck, De Wette.] 'To-day' is, with the Psalmist, probably put for the whole period which has followed upon the Mosaic Era, contemplated as another possible period of national salvation, but which our author refers specially to the time of New Testament deliverance. Indeed, the Psalm itself, under the inspiring Spirit, may have had a prophetic character; and, in its original import, as well as in its present application, have referred to the time of waiting and trial between the appearing of Christ for salvation, and his coming in vengeance to break up the Jewish polity, and destroy the nation. At all events, that 'to-day' now existed. The Jewish people, previously incorrigible, had now another chance to avert their threatened doom. 'If ye shall hear his voice' (literally, *shall have heard;* not, 'If ye *will* hear,' which totally changes the meaning, as in the Common Version). If his voice reaches your ears, and by clear implication brings you another promise, or proffer of rest and of salvation. This is evident from the following, 'harden not your hearts,' and is made still clearer by the subsequent deduction. The author finds in this (ver. 15; 4:7) a proof of a still remaining promise to enter into God's rest. The voice, then, is a voice of glad tidings and proffered salvation. It is a renewal, under a more spiritual import, of the glad promise made to ancient Israel, and assumed by the Psalmist as certain to be made, but which our author can assume to have been actually made. Christ has come and renewed to the people the proffer of the rest of God. (The Hebrew, however, expresses it as a wish, 'Might you hear his voice!' The quotation is from the Septuagint.)

8. Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness. In the original, we have, "As in Meribah (Num. 20:13), as in the day of Massah (Exod. 17:7) in the wilderness." Our author follows the Septuagint, taking the proper names in their etymological signification—'Meribah,' *embitterment, angering, provocation;* 'Massah,' *temptation*—and treats the words, 'in the day of temptation,' as fixing the time of the embitterment or provocation. He deviates in this from the Septuagint, as well as the original; but the deviation is unessential. 'Temptation' is here taken, actively, of tempting God.

9. When (properly, *Where*—in the wilderness) **your fathers tempted me, proved me** (or, *with proving*), **and saw my works**—*my miraculous works*, displays of power on their behalf, whether in bestowing mercies or in punishing their sins—(*during*) **forty years.** The author has transferred this clause from the following verb ("during forty years was I angry") to this connection, and placed after it the particle, *wherefore* (διό), making the divine anger come rather at the close of the forty years, than continue through it. He also reads '*this*' (ταύτῃ) for '*that*' (ἐκείνῃ); thus:

10. Wherefore I was grieved (*angry*) **with that** (*this*) **generation.** These changes can scarcely be without a purpose. They are probably intended to give the passage a more direct and explicit reference to his own day, and, apparently, to point to the forty years' interval between Christ's ascension and the destruction of Jerusalem, a period now, probably, just at its close. The original represents God as, during forty years, displaying his wrath toward the Israelites in the desert. It is more to the purpose of our author to point to the signal display of God's wrath impending at the close of this forty years' time of waiting. It is thus a solemn reminder to the Jews that their probation, and the time of the withholding of God's wrath, is nearly over. It is in remarkable confirmation of this view that the Talmud and the Rabbins also had —in connection with Psalm 95, and the forty years' sojourn of the Jews in the desert—assigned a period of forty years to the "days of the Messiah." The author has evidently

said, They do always err in *their* heart; and they have not known my ways.
11 So I sware in my wrath, They shall not enter into my rest.
12 Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God.
13 But exhort one another daily, while it is called To

And said, They do alway err in their heart:
But they did not know my ways;
11 [1] As I sware in my wrath,
[2] They shall not enter into my rest.
12 Take heed, brethren, lest haply there shall be in any one of you an evil heart of unbelief, in falling
13 away from the living God: but exhort one another day by day, so long as it is called To-day; lest any

1 Or, *So*.....2 Gr. *If they shall enter.*

followed the synagogue in treating the forty years as typical. To sharpen the reference, he changes '*that* generation' into '*this* generation.' This warning could scarcely fall on unaffected minds. **And (I) said**—a formula implying at once the truth and the weight of the utterance—**They do always err** (*are always straying*) **in their heart.** Straying in *heart* is the fountain and essence of all disobedience. The Israelites began their murmurings against God and Moses early (Exod. 17), but constantly repeated them; proved themselves hard and intractable; and, finally, by their unbelief and cowardice, on the very border of the promised land provoked God to turn them back and destroy them. **And they,** etc.—or, *But they did not know my ways.* The Vatican text of the Septuagint reads, *And they* (καὶ αὐτοί), apparently a continuation of what God said; namely, 'And they did not know my ways.' The Alexandrian reading, 'But *they* knew not' (αὐτοὶ δέ) seems to imply this as a part of God's present utterance in regard to the conduct of ancient Israel.

11. So (*that*)[1] **I sware in my wrath, They shall not enter into my rest.** The rest here spoken of is originally the earthly Canaan. It was God's rest ('my rest') in the sense of being bestowed on the people immediately by him. See Deut. 12: 9, 10: "For ye are not as yet come into the rest and the inheritance which the Lord your God giveth you; and ye shall cross the Jordan and shall dwell in the land which the Lord our God shall give you to inherit; and he shall give you rest from all your enemies round about, and ye shall dwell in security." (Septuagint.) For the solemn asseveration of God here referred to, see Num. 14: 23, seq.; Deut 1: 34, 35: "And the Lord heard the voice of your words, and was wroth, and sware, saying, Surely there shall not one of these men of this evil generation see that good land," etc.

12. Take heed (Βλέπετε, *look to it, beware*). The verb, standing with no introductory particle, is peculiarly energetic. It *may* also introduce the answering clause to 'wherefore as' (ver. 7), but I deem it doubtful. **Brethren, lest** (*haply*) **there** (*shall*) **be in any one of you.** Emphasis on 'you,' as contrasted with the ancient unbelievers. The exhortation which the author has already given indirectly, in the words of the Holy Spirit, he now gives directly in his own. **An evil** (πονηρά, *depraved, malignant, intentionally wicked;* stronger than κακή, *bad*) **heart of unbelief.** An unbelieving heart, a heart whose quality and manifestation is *unbelief;* not unfaithfulness, nor disobedience, but that refusal to trust in God which is the parent of both. This unbelief was the great sin of the Israelites in the desert, and caused their apostasy from God. The language is probably suggested by the "always straying in *heart*" of ver. 10. **In departing from** (or, *in falling away,* ἀποστῆναι, *falling off, apostatizing,* not merely isolated acts of disobedience) **the living God.** God is here not the equivalent of Christ; but the Old Testament forms of conception are transferred to the New. God, Deity as such, is also in the New Testament regarded as the ultimate object of worship and source of authority. He sent his Son, he calls, regenerates by the Spirit, justifies, glorifies. 'The living God,' first perhaps as contrasted with *idols,* lifeless images, but subsequently evincing that he *lives* by working within us, by executing his threats, and fulfilling his promises.

13. But exhort one another daily (*day by day*). The language implies the danger in which the readers stood of apostasy; hence, their need of resorting to that powerful means of protection, mutual and *constantly repeated* exhortation. The power of the social element, and the power of *repeated* enforcement of duty are both clearly implied. **While**—that is, *so long as* (ἄχρις οὗ, *up to where,* up to the extreme

[1] Ὡς, literally *as,* but here probably, as corresponding to the Hebrew אֲשֶׁר, equivalent to ὥστε, *so that.*

day; lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin.
14 For we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end;
15 While it is said, To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation.

one of you be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin:
14 for we are become partakers [1]of Christ, if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence firm unto the
15 end: while it is said,
To-day if ye shall hear his voice,
Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation.

1 Or, *with*.

point of time in which) **it is called to-day.** Either, 'while the to-day of the Psalm is called, is named,' while that period lasts which in the Psalm is called 'to-day'; or, while the word 'to-day' is called—that is, uttered, resounds in our ears. The meaning does not vary materially. The 'to-day' of the Psalmist is clearly here applied, not to our individual life, but to the present expectant time before the return of the Messiah, when the final doom of all will be sealed. This 'to-day' had urgent force to the Jews just before the impending judgments. Christ's typical Second Coming broke over their nation as a day of doom, crushing and annihilating their Theocracy; but it survives that crisis and retains undiminished force till the real Second Coming shall settle all destinies forever. **Lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin**—*in order that from you there be none.* 'You' is emphatic, but not as contrasted with the 'fathers' (which would require 'also' (καί), but with reference to their highly favored condition, encompassed by the light and promises of the gospel. (Delitzsch, Moll.) Sin is properly, in its essence, unbelief and apostasy. It is falling away in heart from God. So the author in this Epistle generally conceives it, not in its outward form of 'transgression of the law,' but its inward essence of distrust and abandonment of God. So sin in Eden deceived our first parents and seduced them from God. That deceit which produced the first great apostasy is probably here referred to. But sin always works essentially as it worked first. It deceives and seduces. In the Epistle to the Romans the Apostle is dealing with the theoretical question of justification from the penalty of the law; and sin is a transgression of the law. Here the writer is dealing practically with those who are in danger of apostatizing from God, and sin is apostasy in heart from God.

14. For we are made (or, *have become*). The perfect present tense elegantly and forcibly assumes the result as an accomplished and existing fact. **Partakers of Christ.** The stress of the idea lies, as shown by its position in the best MSS., on 'partakers'; implying that whatever our professions and *hopes*, we have become 'partakers of Christ,' actual sharers of his salvation and kingdom, **if**—*provided that*, and only provided that (ἐάνπερ, *precisely if*, an emphatic form of the conditional particle; see 6: 3)—**we hold fast** (*maintain*) **the beginning of our confidence**; that is, our original confidence, the joyful confidence with which we commenced our Christian profession. Such joyful confidence these Christians had originally shown. (6: 10; 10: 34, 35.) 'The beginning of our confidence,' then, here denotes not imperfection (as Ebrard), much less the 'principle, or foundation of confidence,' namely, faith, nor the 'first foundation of religion.'[1] **Steadfast** (*firm*) **unto the end.** This phrase, probably spurious at ver. 6, is genuine here. It makes a rhetorical antithesis to 'beginning' (ἀρχήν). The 'confidence' with which we *began* must be carried through to the *end*. The whole verse is elegantly and emphatically terse; we have become *participants* of Christ, provided that the beginning of our confidence we maintain steadfast until the end.

15, 16. While it is said, etc., or, *In its being said, To-day if ye shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation. For who, when they heard, did provoke?* The connection of ver. 15 has occasioned much perplexity, and I think has not been satisfactorily settled. Some, putting ver. 14 in parenthesis, have attached it to ver. 13, connecting, however, the words 'In its being said' only with the clause, 'To-day if ye shall hear his voice,' and making the rest a continuance of the writer's exhortation. The utter harshness of this construction renders refutation unnecessary. It could be accepted but as a desperate resort, when all others had

[1] It seems impossible to doubt that ὑπόστασις has in Hellenistic Greek the not unnatural meaning of 'confidence,' and such is its most natural rendering here.

failed. Others construct the verse with that immediately preceding, as epexegetical either of 'unto the end,' or of the conditional clause, 'provided that we hold,' etc. This, too, needs but to be examined to be rejected. The best recent interpretations (as Lünemann, De Wette, Delitzsch, Moll, Kurtz) construct it, by an elliptical usage, not unfamiliar to the Greek language, with the clause immediately following. They render nearly thus: 'In its being said, To-day if ye hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, Why, who, when they heard, provoked him? In its being said thus—who now, who I pray, on hearing, provoked him?' Of the constructions thus far given, this alone can claim a favorable consideration. Its abrupt use of the *for* (γάρ) is a violence which, in many cases, the Greek language rather loves than shrinks from, and it succeeds in reducing to tolerable order a sentence which in either of the preceding constructions admits neither defense nor explanation. But even so constructed, it is harsh and unnatural. It is hard to see why the author should have re-introduced the long quotation for the purpose of commenting on the word 'provocation,' and if he did, why he should introduce the commenting clause in so abrupt and harsh a way, which transcends the ordinary limits of Greek prose and stretches the license of the language beyond anything elsewhere exhibited in this Epistle. The question, "For who, on hearing, provoked him?" *looks* very much like an after thought, as if it sprang up in the mind of the writer, suggested by the previous word 'provocation'; and it is not difficult to suppose that such is really its origin, and that it led him away for the moment from the thought with which he had commenced. Such is, on the whole, my own decided conviction. I follow the Greek interpreters, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Œcumenius, in regarding it as an unfinished construction, in which the thought, temporarily suspended, is subsequently resumed, though in a somewhat different form. Taking it as a broken construction, there are two ways in which we may fill out the ellipsis. We may suppose that the writer, having finished one form of his exhortation, was going to make a *deduction* from the words, 'To-day if ye shall hear his voice,' etc.; namely, that in its being so said, we discover that the promise of the rest of God was not exhausted upon the ancient Israelites, but that the later promise, and in a still more spiritual form, remains open to us—a thought which lies, of course, in the words, and which he proceeds in the next chapter to develop, employing there our passage as his decisive and crowning proof: or we may take Chrysostom's explanation that it is a *hyperbaton*, or reversal of the natural order; that the immediate form of the conception was hortatory, and that the thought is virtually renewed in the 'Let us fear, therefore,' of chapter 4: 1. In this case the thought is a continuation of the preceding exhortation, though the author no doubt intended to introduce the additional topic of the promised rest remaining open to us; and the conception in his mind might be: 'In its being said, To-day if ye shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts as in the provocation, let us fear, lest, there remaining a promise of entering into his rest,' etc. This would be a most natural inference from the quotation, and a natural continuation of the preceding passage. And with this thought in his mind, nothing could be more natural than to pause abruptly at the word provocation, and enforce the 'Let us fear' which was in his *mind* by calling to mind *who* they were who failed of the ancient rest, and why they failed of it. This, in fact, makes the interposed verses 16–19 most strikingly and cogently appropriate, while at the same time the long break in the sentence naturally leads the writer to return to the suspended thought with *therefore* (οὖν), and thus leave our verse strictly unfinished. Let the reader look carefully at the entire passage. Suppose the author were about to say, 'In its being said, To day, if ye shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts as in the provocation, let us recognize the promise which is left to us also of entering into his rest, and the danger of our failing of it,' how natural that when he reached the word which reminded him of the provocation given by ancient Israel, and of the unbelief and rebellion by which *they* forfeited the promised rest, he should pause to dwell upon it in enforcement of his exhortation (especially as it was the natural train of thought which would come in after the parallel drawn between Moses and Christ, and which had not before been explicity referred to), and then resume precisely as he does at chapter 4: 1: "Let us fear, there-

16 For some, when they had heard, did provoke: howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses.
17 But with whom was he grieved forty years? *was it* not with them that had sinned, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness?
18 And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not?

16 For who, when they heard, did provoke? nay, did
17 not all they who came out of Egypt by Moses? And with whom was he displeased forty years? was it not with them that sinned, whose [1]carcases fell in the
18 wilderness? And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that were

1 Gr. *limbs.*

fore, lest, there still remaining a promise," etc. That Chrysostom is in the main right, therefore, in his explanation, I cannot doubt; although I deem it questionable whether the form of expression, 'Let us fear, therefore,' was not suggested by the terrible examples just previously given, and whether the thought to be supplied was not of a more general character. 'In its being said,' etc., let us recognize the fact of a promise still remaining to us, and the danger of our forfeiting it, as did the ancient Israelites. Nor is the break in the construction unusually harsh or violent. It seems to me extremely natural, and the fact that Chrysostom and his fellow Grecians assume it without hesitation or difficulty, though not decisive, is strongly in its favor.

16. For some (or, *For who*), **when they had heard, did provoke** (*him*). The 'heard' and 'did provoke' are both suggested by the words of the quotation. The question is put to call to the minds of the readers the number and character of those who anciently forfeited the rest of Canaan and perished under the wrath of God.[1] **Howbeit not all,** etc. (rather, *Nay, did not all those who came out of Egypt through Moses?*) Each part of this sentence enhances the emphasis of the whole. Was it not those who 'came out from Egypt,' whom God had so highly favored by interposing in their behalf, and rescuing them from bondage? Was it not those who came out '*through Moses*,' the great leader, lawgiver, prophet, and earthly head of the Jewish theocracy, whom this distinguished servant of God had led forth? And was it not the *whole* of them? Did not the entire body commit the sin and reap the punishment? From the fate of a whole community, who had thus heard the delivering and promising voice of God, and been redeemed by his most eminent servant, his readers might well take warning. The two or three individual exceptions (as Caleb and Joshua) to the general crime and fate of the people, do not affect the substantial accuracy of the statement.

17. But with whom (or, *And with whom*) **was he grieved** (*angry*) **forty years?** The author here returns to the Septuagint construction of the 'forty years,' connecting them with the verb 'to be angry.' This shows that the change made above, though not strictly accidental, nor, probably, without a definite purpose, was yet not at all vital to his object in making the quotation. Having before drawn attention to the character of the persons who formerly incurred the divine displeasure and forfeited the promise, he now, with equal pertinence, points to the *means* by which they did it. **Was it not with them that had sinned?** Not, 'with them that are from time to time sinning,' or violating God's law. Their sin is here conceived as one collective sin (aorist participle, ἁμαρτήσασιν); namely, falling away from God, precisely that which his readers are now in imminent danger of committing. **Whose carcasses fell in the wilderness.** This clause many editors include in the previous interrogations; but they certainly are in error. It is no proper reply to the question, With whom was he angry? He was angry with them that *sinned.* And this is a natural and forcible addition to remind them of the consequences of that sin and that wrath. The 'whose' may be rendered by 'and their': 'and their carcasses[2] fell in the wilderness'; according to the threat in Num. 14:32. 'Fell,' by a usage equally common—of the Greek word (πίπτω), and the English, *fall—were overthrown, prostrated, destroyed.*

18. And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? 'Believed not'—more exactly, *disobeyed;* but as we thus lose the correspondence of words — the Greek 'disobedience' and 'unbelief' (ἀπείθειαν and

[1] We need write no words in defending the τίνες and τίσιν, *who* and *to whom* of the critical editions, instead of τινές and τισίν, *some* and *to some*, of the Textus Receptus.
[2] Κῶλα, *members, limbs, carcasses.*

19 So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief.

19 disobedient? And we see that they were not able to enter in because of unbelief.

CHAPTER IV.

LET us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left *us* of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it.

1 Let us fear therefore, lest haply, a promise being left of entering into his rest, any one of you should
2 seem to have come short of it. For indeed we have

ἀπιστίαν) having a near etymological and phonetic relation—we, perhaps, lose more in the antithesis of ver. 18 and 19, by retaining 'disobeying,' than we gain in exactness of meaning. In the author's conception, as also in fact, 'disobedience' is but just the natural expression of unbelief. Had the sentence corresponded in form to the preceding as it does in thought, it would have run thus: And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest? Was it not to them that (disobeyed) believed not? This question advances on the preceding both in definiteness and pungency. The former declared God's *wrath* for *sin* in its most general statement; this declares the effect of that wrath in exclusion from his rest, and the sin in its principle, a 'heart of *unbelief*.' The author is bringing round the thought in his characteristic manner to the topic in his mind (as, I believe) at ver. 15, and to be formally taken up in chapter 4.

19. So we see (better, *And we behold*) **that they could not enter in because of unbelief.** There is here no Q. E. D. from a preceding argument, as held by Ebrard, with many interpreters, and implied by the erroneous 'so' of the Common Version. It simply (Delitzsch) has reference to the immediately preceding quotation and its answer, and is an emphatic statement, by a reference to what we *behold*, what is presented to our view on the page of history, of the consequences of that unbelief, in the oath of exclusion to which it led. The 'and we behold' is not logical, as concluding a train of reasoning, but simply refers us to the Old Testament record as *showing* that the awful oath of exclusion was carried into effect. It thus stands related to ver. 18 just as the last clause of ver. 17 stands related to the preceding clause. They stand in substantial parallelism thus:

And with whom was he angry during forty years?
Was it not with them that sinned?
And their carcasses fell in the wilderness!

And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest?
Was it not to them that believed not?
And we *see* that they were unable to enter in because of unbelief!

The idea that this last verse is, in some indefinable way, the winding up of a chain of reasoning, has confused many interpreters. As above analyzed (Delitzsch and Moll), it becomes perfectly clear. This passage, which has thus tersely set forth the prerogatives, the sin, and the fate of the ancient people of God, leads also, naturally, to the warning, "Let us, therefore, fear," with which the next chapter opens, and the discussion of the topic of the promised rest, forfeited by ancient Israel, being still open to the people of God, as implied in the language of the Psalmist.

Ch. 4. (3) *The rest of God forfeited by ancient Israel still open under its higher form, as God's Sabbatic rest, to the spiritual Israel.* (1–10.)

1. With the fact of the awful stumbling and fall of ancient Israel still fresh in his mind, the author commences the present chapter with an exhortation which, while it introduces a new topic, links itself closely with the preceding. The new thought is: "There is still *remaining* (while there still remaineth) a promise of entering into his rest"; the exhortation is: **Let us therefore fear** (in view of this terrible fall of Israel under Moses) **lest any of you should seem to come short of it** (or, *may seem to have come short of it*). We must bear in mind that the fact of the remaining of this promise of rest to us is here momentarily assumed. It does not follow from anything which has been previously said, except by an implication, which the author subsequently develops. It is in no way a direct inference from the unbelief and overthrow of Israel in the desert. To reason from the failure of ancient Israel

to obtain the promised rest to the continuance or transfer of that promise to a later age, is, as Delitzsch justly observes, a piece of inconsequence which we are not to charge upon our author. He does not so reason in the slightest degree. He argues it simply and exclusively from the Psalm, which he has already cited, and in which citation he finds this continued or repeated promise clearly implied. And an analysis of the passage shows how just is his conclusion, and how singularly pertinent, therefore, was the Psalm to the purpose for which he quoted it. 'To-day if ye shall hear his voice' points to a probability, or, rather, a certainty, that the Israelites of this later period *would* hear (or, *did* hear) the voice of God coming to them with the renewal of the ancient promise of rest, the like joyful message with that which came to their fathers. The warning to them against hardening their hearts after the example of their fathers, and the reminding them of the terrible penalty which their father's unbelief incurred—namely, a forfeiture of the rest of God—have no pertinence, except on the assumption that a like joyful message and promise of rest has come, or is to come, to them, and which they are in danger of forfeiting by a like unbelief. On this passage, and, for the present discussion, on *nothing else*, the author founds his assertion that a promise of rest still awaits the people of God. The 'to-day' of the Psalmist he conceives, of course, as extending indefinitely down to the next great catastrophe in Jewish history, if not as being, what it very possibly was, a direct prophecy of the proffer of spiritual rest to be made to the people by the Messiah. In this interpretation he is fully warranted. The passage cannot mean anything less, nor anything else. It requires no rabbinical subtilizing, and no ingenious or verbal sophistry. There stands out, as clearly involved in it as if it were stated in the fullest and most express terms, that the once forfeited promise of entering into God's rest stands over, or is repeated to a later age. But another thing the author assumes, and *can but assume:* In view of the fact that the people to whom this promise of rest first came disobeyed and perished, *the whole of them*, that they were not the true people of God; and in view of the fact that this promise is now repeated centuries after the Jews entered Canaan, that the real rest of the promise was a higher rest, of which the rest of Canaan was but typical. He is justified, therefore, in looking farther, and inquiring what *is* the true rest which was indicated by that pregnant and mighty phrase, the rest of God. Yet all this is but inferential from the one central, decisive passage. He plants himself on his interpretation of the Spirit's language of the Old Testament. Finding it affirmed that a promise of entering into the rest of God is renewed to later Israel, he thence simply looks back and inquires what light this sheds upon the nature of the rest of Canaan, and looks around to see what must be the rest which, at this late stage, is offered to the people of God. He finds but one explanation. He links it with the Sabbath rest of God at the close of the Creation, and into which the institution of the Sabbath for man shows that it was God's purpose that man should enter. The following verses now proceed straight forward, very elliptically and tersely, but with undeniable justice and force, to develop this line of thought. He is not, however, in ver. 1–7, going through the several steps of an argumentation to *prove* the point that there remains a rest. Planting himself on his *interpretation* of the Scriptures, he is simply developing the *inferences* from that statement, and especially the grand inference as to the spiritual and Sabbatic nature of this promised rest. 'Let us therefore fear.' This certainly is not, strictly and *in form*, the answering and continuing clause of the seemingly (and, I believe, really) unfinished 3 : 15, 'In its being said,' etc., all between being strictly parenthetical. But that the author does really proceed to develop the thought which he then had in mind, and from which he abruptly turned aside—namely, what was really implied, both of fact and of warning, in that language—I see no good reason for doubting. He approaches it, however, in a different manner, with the emphatic 'Let us therefore fear' caught from the awful examples of unbelief which he has just cited. The *then, therefore* (οὖν) reasons from those examples to our need of fear; not from their having forfeited a promise to its transfer to us. **Lest a promise being left us** (or, *there still remaining a promise*) **of entering into his rest.** Emphasis on the 'remaining,' as shown by its position, as well as the connec-

2 For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as
unto them: but the word preached did not profit them,
not being mixed with faith in them that heard *it*.
3 For we which have believed do enter into rest, as

had [1] good tidings preached unto us, even as also
they: but the word of hearing did not profit them,
because [2] it was not united by faith with them that
3 heard. [3] For we who have believed do enter into
that rest; even as he hath said,

1 Or, *a gospel*.....2 Many ancient authorities read *they were*.....3 Some authorities read *We therefore*.

tion.[1] The burden of the thought now to be illustrated—namely, that the promise of entering into God's rest was not exhausted upon ancient Israel, but renewed, and remains, in a heightened form, to the Christian Israel—is contained in this clause. 'Any one of you may seem to have come short of it.' 'Of you' (ἐξ ὑμῶν, *from you*) is clearly emphatic. We may observe, too, the significant change of person, from the first person plural of the hortatory, 'Let us fear.' There the author puts himself into the category of his hearers to win their favorable hearing. But his *solicitude* is, after all, not for himself, but for them. Not *he*, but *they*, are in danger of apostasy; and the close of the sentence forgets, in its earnestness, the rhetorical modesty of the opening, and converges the whole force of the appeal upon those for whom it was properly intended. 'May seem' (δοκῇ), a word which *may* be taken as giving emphasis to the meaning, 'lest any of you may—not only not have come short, but may *seem* to have come short.' (Delitzsch.) This, however, would almost require an accompanying *even* (καί), 'may even *seem*'; and I prefer to regard it rather as softening the force of the expression. As if the writer could not bear to conceive of their having come actually short, he connects with it an unemphatic 'may seem' (δοκῇ), may be accounted, to have come short—a use of the verb not unfamiliar to classical Greek, which often puts the words "to seem," instead of "to be," the *seeming*, or *being accounted*, for the *being*. 'To have come short,' with reference, probably, to the Jews under Moses having *fallen short* of entering the promised land. Ebrard's construction of the passage (following Wahl, Bretschneider), "may think that he has arrived too late," though grammatically possible, has no other recommendation. It is inconsistent with the emphatic 'Let us fear,' which should rather have run, 'Let not any of us fear that we have arrived too late, that there is not still a promise for us,' which would have made a not inappropriate sense, though not the one required here.

2. This verse states categorically what ver. 1 had stated informally and indirectly. **For unto us was the gospel preached,** etc. It may be rendered, *For we have had the glad message, the promise of a rest, just as did also they.* The emphasis lies not on the 'us' (or *we*), but on the verb *have had*, as against a possible denial of the fact. **But the word preached** (*the word of their hearing*) **did not profit them**—'them' with emphasis, the clause being added half incidentally, but important as recalling the fact stated above and renewing to the readers the warning drawn from the failure of ancient Israel to profit by the promise, and finding in that failure a ground for the promise's renewal. Had it *fulfilled* itself in them, there could have been no room for its repetition. **Not being mixed with faith in them** (*not having mixed itself by faith with them*) **that heard it.**[2] It was merely a word of hearing (referring to the "to-day, if ye hear" above); it did not penetrate their hearts; receiving it with the *ear*, they were rebellious and forfeited it. (De Wette explains: "For the good of them them that heard it"; others, "in respect to.")

3. For we which have believed do enter into rest—that is, we enter, or are entering, into rest, as those who have believed. 'Receiving the glad tidings' is now 'entering into rest,' on which lies the primary emphasis, reaffirming our having received renewedly the promise, while a secondary emphasis lies on the *believing*, as contrasted with the unbelief

[1] Καταλείπειν, *To leave down*, to leave still remaining, and, as it were, firm. Not, 'the promise being relinquished, abandoned' (as many), which, besides being less in accordance with the context, would much more naturally take the active, instead of the passive participle, and the article with ἐπαγγελίαν (καταλείψας, or, καταλείψαντες τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν.)

[2] A better *externally* attested reading, which makes the participle agree with "them" (συγκεκραμένους), makes no tolerable sense; "not having united themselves by faith with them (that is, Caleb and Joshua) that heard"; that is, *obeyed*, taking ἀκούειν here as equivalent to ὑπακούειν. But the change is violent and improbable.

he said, As I have sworn in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest: although the works were finished from the foundation of the world.

[1] As I sware in my wrath,
[2] They shall not enter into my rest:
although the works were finished from the founda-

1 Or, *So*.....2 Gr. *If they shall enter.*

which excluded the ancient recipients of the promise. Many interpreters rest the main emphasis on the believing, but I think that still the author's main scope is the fact of the promise being renewed to the later Israel. The 'we who have believed' marks also not *individual* faith, or the actuality of its possession; but *faith*, as the condition of our entering into rest, as against the faithlessness which excluded the original receivers of the promise. The present verb 'we enter' (εἰσερχόμεθα) may be taken in its generality, as the successive heirs of the New Testament promise, or as denoting the now incompleted act; like the Israelites in the wilderness, we are moving on toward our spiritual Canaan. (*According*) **as he** (*hath*) **said, As I have sworn** (*so that I sware*) **in my wrath, if they shall** (*they shall not*) **enter into my rest.** Quoted from the above warning to the later Israel not to repeat the disastrous unbelief of their fathers; but quoted specially for the verbal correspondence of its phrase 'enter into my rest' with the 'entering into rest' just affirmed of New Testament believers, and to lead the way to a statement of the nature of this rest, called significantly 'my'—that is, God's—'rest.' In the original declaration the 'my' is *objective*, the rest which God *bestows* (Canaan); here it is *subjective*, the rest which God *enjoys*, and into which he admits his people. This is shown by the immediately following explanation. **Although the** (*his*) **works were** (*had been*) **finished from the foundation of the world,** and thus the rest established into which God could admit his creatures. The author's procedure is justified by the Psalm from which he quotes. This proffers an entrance into the rest of God to the later Israel centuries after the elder Israel had entered Canaan. What, then, could be this rest of God again proffered them, and which they are so solemnly warned against forfeiting? The problem is a legitimate one. He is not *asserting* that the ancient Canaan was not the true rest, and then looking round for another meaning to the expression. He simply *infers* from this rest of God being offered to the Jews centuries after the Jews entered Canaan, that Canaan *could not have been the true rest*, and inquires what was so; what that typical rest prefigured. He turns back to the rest into which God entered at the creation, and this, as is shown by his instituting the Sabbath, and blessing and hallowing the day, not for himself, but for humanity. The Sabbath was made for man, and it might well be believed that when the work of redemption should be accomplished, the rest of God, of which it was now a blessed reminder, should fulfill its original purpose, and be a spiritual Sabbath for a regenerated world. With the Fall, along with the curse of death, came the curse of toil—the sweat of the brow and the unrest of the soul; and through the lips of the parents of Noah humanity uttered its longing for deliverance, "this same shall comfort us concerning (Septuagint, διαπαύσει, *shall bring us to rest from*) our work and the toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed." Meantime God had entered into his rest, not for himself (for in truth as for God there can be properly no work, so for him there can be no rest; as he can never more than exercise his omnipotence, so he can never less than exercise it), but for man. He had given to man the Sabbath, as a token of his beneficent purpose, and impressed the belief that ultimately, when the curse of death (of which the Messiah was to be the destruction) should be removed, the penalty of toil and spiritual unrest would be removed also. Of that bondage of the race, the bondage of Israel in Egypt was a type; of its deliverance, that deliverance; of Jesus, its Deliverer, Moses and Joshua, the one inaugurating, the other completing, the deliverances, were types; of that rest Canaan itself, with its milk and honey (both obtained largely without labor) was a type. Yet *but* a type, earthly, physical, temporary, for a single people. What is needed is a rest for the spirit, for mankind, forever; the rest of God, the Sabbatism of the race. It was no violence to find this Sabbatic rest under the type of Canaan; to transform the partial, earthly, transient, troubled rest of Canaan into the universal, spiritual, everlasting, perfect rest of the Messiah's kingdom, into which the great Antitype of both Moses

4 For he spake in a certain place of the seventh *day* on this wise, And God did rest the seventh day from all his works.
5 And in this *place* again, If they shall enter into my rest.

4 tion of the world. For he hath said somewhere of the seventh *day* on this wise, And God rested on the
5 seventh day from all his works; and in this *place* again,
[1] They shall not enter into my rest.

1 Gr. *If they shall enter.*

and Joshua shall ultimately lead his people. And in this view most significant is the change of the Sabbath from the day of the finished work of creation to the day of the finished work of redemption. It implies that the true Sabbatism of the race would be realized in Jesus. The author is justified, therefore,—taking for granted that the rest described is not the rest of Canaan,—in referring it back in his pregnantly elliptical language to the Sabbatic rest of God. I say elliptical, because it is equivalent to his works being finished *at*, and then his rest continuing *from*, the foundation of the world. The precise dependence of the participle in the original (γενηθέντων), translated 'were finished,' is doubtful; whether (with Kuinoel) on "hath said" (εἴρηκεν): thus, "he hath said," etc., "although his works had been finished"; and thus he could speak of a rest; or on "they shall not enter into" (εἰσελεύσονται), implying that there was a rest from which he could speak of excluding them. But it is more in accordance with the context, I think, to regard it as epexegetical of the immediately preceding phrase, and added to intimate what kind of a rest it implies;[1] that it points back really to the Sabbath rest of God. The author here commences to define, in the light of the subsequent *repetition* of the promise, the true import of that promise, which to ancient Israel was veiled under its more carnal and earthly guise, but which, with advancing time, reveals its spiritual character. That which remains, he decides, must be the promise of entering into the Sabbath rest of God. To make this more clear he adds:

4, 5. For (in confirmation of my statement that God's rest was established in the completion of his works at the foundation of the world) **he spake in a certain place,** etc., or, *hath said somewhere.* 'Somewhere' does not imply ignorance of the locality of the passage, but is simply rhetorical. **Of** (*concerning*) **the seventh day** (*the Sabbath*, the day of Sabbatic rest) **on this wise. And God did rest the seventh day from all his works.** While the passage is quoted for its general sentiment, its special emphasis is on *rested* (κατέπαυσεν), bringing it into verbal, as well as real connection, with his doctrine of the Sabbatic rest. **And in this place again, If they shall enter** (*they shall not enter*) **into my rest.** The previous verse has shown when and how God established his rest; the present renewed quotation reminds us that the rest *exists*, and by declaring the *exclusion* of some, clearly implies that it was originally *designed* to be entered by his creatures; the negative declaration, 'they shall not enter,' having no force unless on the assumption of its being under the proper conditions accessible to mortals.

6. The author now proceeds to his conclusions. Let us review the elements with which he has to deal: (1) From history he knows that ancient Israel had a promise of entering into the land of Canaan—the rest of God, as bestowed by God. (2) By disobedience they forfeited the promise, and came short of it —God, in his wrath, excluding them from it. (3) The quoted Psalm shows that the promise is renewed at a later date, about four hundred years after, in the time of David—"To-day, if ye shall hear his voice"—clearly implying that they will, or have heard it—the voice of the renewed proffer of God's rest. (4) But this renewed proffer goes over the head of the fact that though Israel under Moses did not enter the promised land, their descendants *did*; the promise was, to *them*, literally fulfilled. And yet, notwithstanding this, the voice of the promise sounded on all the same, showing that as the people under Moses had shown themselves not to be God's true people, so the rest of Canaan had been shown not to be the true rest. The congregation in the wilderness, with its elaborate organization, had proved itself to be but a typical church—the rest of Canaan had been proved to be but a typical rest. (5) By a deduction which the

[1] The somewhat vague particle καίτοι, with which the passage opens, is commonly nearly equivalent to *although*; and to this meaning here there is no objection. I think, however, it may mean, "and you see," "and in sooth," not being so much adversative as continuative.

6 Seeing therefore it remaineth that some must enter therein, and they to whom it was first preached entered not in because of unbelief:

6 Seeing therefore it remaineth that some should enter thereinto, and they to whom [1] the good tidings were before preached failed to enter in because of diso-

1 Or, *the gospel was.*

whole Sabbath history justifies (and which I believe to be the Spirit of God's comment on his own word), the promised rest of God thus disengages itself from the land of Canaan, and links itself with the Sabbath rest into which God entered, and which he instituted for his creatures, from the foundation of the world. **Seeing** (or, *since*) **therefore it remaineth.** The Greek word here is not equivalent in sense to the same word in ver. 1, translated 'remaineth,' *is left behind, not taken away.* Here it means, *is left open, stands in reserve*, as a thing attainable. **That some must** (rather, *should*, or, *may*) **enter therein.** All that is needful to establish is that the rest *exists* and is *accessible;* there is no need to prove that it *must* be entered. **And they to whom,** etc.—or, *They who formerly received the glad message, did not enter in because of disobedience.* These are the conditions under which the proffer and promise could be renewed. But we may inquire, How was the overthrow of Israel in the desert a condition of its renewal? If the entrance of the next generation into the promised land did not stand in the way of its renewal, how could the disobedience and fall of the fathers be in any way a condition of that renewal? To this I answer, first, that we are not, unduly, to press the condition. The author has not in mind any intrinsic and absolute connection between the two facts, but one existing in the actual ordering of Providence. Although there was no absolute necessity, God made the final falling away of the Jews, and their breaking up as a people, the condition of the reception of the Gentiles, so that their overthrow was the riches of the Gentiles, and their stumbling the riches of the world. So, in his sovereign pleasure, God permitted the overthrow of the congregation in the wilderness, and conditioned, *in some sort*, upon their rejection of the promise, its renewal in a later age. But how "in some sort"? I answer secondly, that the Jews who came out of Egypt stood in much the same relation to the Jewish people, that the Jewish nation, as a whole, did to the Gentiles. They were, in a peculiar and pre-eminent sense, the representative people of God; they left Egypt, the house of their bondage, under Moses, the great type of the Great Spiritual Deliverer; they knew, in a pre-eminent degree, what it was to bear the yoke of oppression; and to them came, with special emphasis, the promise of rest from toil. A few months' direct journeying across the desert would have brought them from the "house of bondage" to the home of freedom and of joy. Again, the Jews who came out of Egypt were the first organized people of God. For them was raised up Moses—the great deliverer, lawgiver, prophet, intercessor—who stood face to face with God, and offered himself as a sacrifice for the nation. To them was given the law from Mount Sinai; to them came the ordinances of the Theocracy. When, therefore, that whole body perished in the wilderness, together with their leader, Moses; when not a man of those who came out of Egypt under Moses, save Caleb and Joshua (and this is the significance of the "all," 3:16), survived to enter Canaan, the fact was of weightiest import. It proved that the congregation in the wilderness was not the genuine people of God, and the coming short, even of Moses, showed him to be not the true spiritual leader. And we cannot fail to remark that in allowing both the people who came out of Egypt, and their great leader, all alike to come short of the promised land, God *intended* to mark, signally, their merely typical character, and thus justified the use made of it by our author, apart, even, from the express warrant which he finds for it in the Psalm. Once more. We find a warrant for regarding the failure of ancient Israel to enter into the rest of God, as opening the way for a later renewal of the promise, in the general development of God's plans and purposes through successive stages and ages of the world's history. The promised rest of the people of God is not in the writer's conception, or that of the New Testament generally, *heaven*, as an existing place of rest for each soul as it leaves its fleshly tenement. It is a *period*, an age, farther down the track of the ages; a state into which humanity, or the

7 Again, he limiteth a certain day, saying in David,
To day, after so long a time; as it is said,
To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts.
8 For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not
afterward have spoken of another day.

7 bedience, he again defineth a certain day, To-day,
saying in David, so long a time afterward (even as
hath been said before),
To-day if ye shall hear his voice,
Harden not your hearts.
8 For if [1]Joshua had given them rest, he would not

1 Gr. *Jesus*.

destined people of God, are yet to enter. On the relation of each departing individual soul to this coming state, the sacred writers bestowed comparatively little attention. The grand object of their view is not the unseen heavenly world in distinction from the earthly, but the coming age, with its glory, in distinction from the present. To the Jew, that coming age was the age of the Messiah. To the Christian, for whom the Messiah had come, and was to come again, the coming age (already present, from the Old Testament point of view) linked itself with that second appearing, when was to be realized to the church the Sabbath rest of God. Regarded as an epoch, a stage in which humanity reached its final goal, the promises must not have been earlier fulfilled and exhausted. Slow but sure is God's march down the ages.

7. Again, he limiteth (*He again fixeth*) **a certain day, saying in David**—that is, not in the Book of Psalms regarded as collectively by David (nor, analagously, to "in Elijah" (Rom. 11:2), designating a part of the Scripture treating of Elijah), but *in*, for *by*, David personally; and this the more probably, as the Septuagint attributes this Psalm to David—**after so long a time**—that is, so long a time after the early promise and its forfeiture (it belongs to 'saying'). **To day as it is** (*hath been*) **said, To day, if ye will** (*shall*) **hear his voice, harden not your hearts.** The first 'to day' may be taken separately as defining the 'certain day' (he fixeth a certain day; namely, 'to day'), or (with Delitzsch, Kurtz, etc.) as placed emphatically before 'saying,' and then repeated with the rest of the quotation. This construction seems, on the whole, more natural in the Greek.[1] As to the meaning, there is no difficulty. The parenthesis, 'as hath been said before,' is thrown in by way of half apology for the renewed repetition of the quotation from the Psalm. But in the quotation lies the kernel of the argument. The 'to day, if ye shall hear his voice,' etc., implies that they do, or will again hear, the same voice of promise, whence the inference that the rest of Palestine did not exhaust or fulfill it. The 'to day' is taken as substantially a prophecy—a prediction that the gracious voice of God would again sound in their ears, and an entreaty that they would not, under the gracious proffer, renew the disobedience of their fathers. The 'to day' is really the day of the Messianic epoch. To the Jews as a people, it is the time that shall elapse between Christ's summons to repentance and the sealing of their destinies in his typical return at the overthrow of Jerusalem. To the New Testament people of God, the spiritual Israel, it is the time intervening between his first coming to bring the gospel message of salvation, and the final coming, that shall fix all destinies.

8. For if Jesus (*Joshua*) **had given them rest,** etc.—had brought them to rest—**he** (God, or the prophet on his behalf) *would not after this be speaking*—(ἐλάλει, the writer throws the speaking into his own time)—**of another day.** An irrefragable inference on which we need not dwell. The destruction of the followers of Moses proved that the congregation in the wilderness was not the true church of God, and left room for the true spiritual church. So the promise, renewed long subsequently to Israel's entrance into Palestine, proves that the rest of Canaan was not the true rest of God. Thus the author, by implication, disposes of the claims, both of Moses and Joshua, in comparison with Christ. Moses brought the people out of Egypt, but could not bring them into the promised land. Joshua brought the nation into Canaan; but it was not the true rest of the people of God. We have but to follow the story of its fortunes to see how far was the ancient Israel from rest. Its enemies within and around, its civil strifes and foreign wars, its apostasies, its captivities, its enslavements—are anything but the record

1 Ἐν Δαυεὶδ λέγων with the σήμερον seems more natural. Without the σήμερον we should expect λέγων ἐν Δαυείδ

9 There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God.
10 For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God *did* from his.
11 Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief.

9 have spoken afterward of another day. There remaineth therefore a sabbath rest for the people of
10 God. For he who is entered into his rest hath himself also rested from his works, as God did from his.
11 Let us therefore give diligence to enter into that rest, that no man fall [1] after the same example of

1 Or, *into*. Gr. *in*.

of a nation arrived at peace. Had Israel been faithful indeed, God must have fulfilled his utmost promises. But the rebellions of Palestine repeated the rebellions of the desert, until at last the star of Judah was quenched in darkness and blood. The way is prepared for the author's final conclusion.

9. There remaineth therefore—the writer triumphantly concludes—**a rest** (*a Sabbath rest, a Sabbatism*[1]) **to** (*for*) **the people of God.** *Sabbatism*, for which the previous word "rest" (κατάπαυσις) is here exchanged, is a Hebrew-Greek word, found but once in classic Greek ("Plutarch de Superstitione," 3), but appositely used in the summing up of the argument by which the typical rest of Canaan is carried over into and identified with the Sabbath rest of God, instituted at creation; a rest as much superior to the latter as the God in whom lies the one is superior to the Canaan that vainly proffered the other; a real rest, with its heavenly Jerusalem—a city with *foundations*—from which they shall go no more out; a real Paradise, where they shall "rest from their labors," with no more curse of sin and toil. One step further by way of explaining what is implied in this Sabbatism.

10. For he that is entered, etc.; or, *he who hath entered into his* (*God's*) *rest, he also hath himself rested* (*ceased*) *from his work, as God did from his own.* God's rest was a real rest; to the apprehension of his creatures, and in every applicable sense, he entered into rest. So with his creatures who enjoy this holy Sabbatism. They rest from the toil and woe entailed by sin. Employment, activity, no matter how protracted and intense, but no toil! Some make Jesus 'he who entered into rest,' as the Forerunner of his people. The thought is not inapposite, yet less closely connected with the context, and a reference to Jesus would have been probably made more unequivocal.[2]

(4) *Renewed exhortation in view of the renewed promise of a higher rest, and based on the spiritual and searching qualities of the word; and transition, through their need of a sympathizing high priest, to the next and chief topic of the Epistle.* (11–16.)

11. Let us labour (*be zealous*) **therefore to enter into that rest;** that is, this New Testament rest of God, which, designed for all, may be forfeited by any. The author is not a fatalist. Christ suffered death for every man, but individual fidelity must appropriate its benefits. The holy Sabbath rest awaits the collective people of God; but each must make good his claim by persevering to the end. "He that endureth to the end shall be saved." (Matt. 10:22.) **Lest any man** (*that no man*) **fall after the same example of unbelief** (*disobedience*)—literally, *in* the same example, a pregnant expression, I think equivalent to after the example of the same disobedience. Luther, Alford, Lünemann, and Kurtz, understand it, of falling *into* (and then remaining *in*) the same disobedience as the Fathers, and like them becoming a warning example to others. Many others (as Chrysostom, Bengel, Bleek, De Wette, Moll) interpret 'fall' as equivalent to *perish* (πέσῃ, 3:17) *in*, or *by way of giving the same example* to others. I do not think the unemphatic position of 'fall' (πέσῃ) in the Greek decides against this; nor yet do I think that the author is thinking of them as an example to others, but rather as following the example of their ancestors. I think, therefore, the rendering of the Common and Revised Versions substantially right.[3]

[1] The Com. Ver., by substituting the word previously used, 'rest' (as if it were κατάπαυσις), has thus unfortunately taken the point out of the entire argument.

[2] The aorist, 'he who entered,' may, with the Greek partiality for the aorist, easily stand for the perfect, "he who hath entered."

[3] The word ὑπόδειγμα (*example*) is something *shown in subordination to* (ὑπό), either to imitate as a *copy*, or to be imitated as a *pattern*. Here it is generally taken as *example, pattern*, in whichever sense 'fall' (πέσῃ) be taken. It might, perhaps, here be taken as *copy;* by way of copying the same disobedience. There is no reference to the gospel in contrast with the dead letter of the law (Ebrard), nor strictly to its *enduring* character, though this follows from its inherent vitality. It has a vital force as coming from the Living God.

12 For the word of God *is* quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and *is* a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.
13 Neither is there any creature that is not manifest

12 disobedience. For the word of God is living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and quick to discern the
13 thoughts and intents of the heart. And there is no

12. Enforcement of this exhortation from the nature of the divine word. **For the word of God is quick** (*living*). There is probably no ground for finding, with many ancient interpreters and some more recent, a reference here to the hypostatic Logos, nor probably for the indirect and half latent reference to him assumed by Delitzsch. The context suggests the meaning. God's words of promise and threatening and command to his ancient people are ringing in our ears, as not to be trifled with. It is the intrinsic character of God's utterances (conceived here perhaps primarily as commanding and threatening) that are described first as *living*, having in them no quality of deadness, but partaking the life of the Being from whom they proceed, and hence never falling idle or vain. **And powerful** (*energetic, full of energy, effective*), **sharper** (*more cutting*) **than any twoedged sword.** A sharp sword issues (Rev. 19 : 15) out of the mouth of the "Word of God." A double-edged sword is not necessarily sharper than a single-edged one, but it is more cutting, as being comparatively all edge. Philo says of the power of the divine word that it is "a cutter of all things" (τόμος συμπάντων), "dividing the rational soul from the irrational"—a thought akin to, but less spiritual than, that of our Epistle. **Piercing** (*penetrating*) **even to the dividing** (μερισμός, taken actively, the dividing, so as to divide) **of soul and spirit, and of** (*both*) **the joints and marrow.** The general import of this is clear. It denotes the judicially penetrating power of God's word into the utmost depths of our nature. But the special construction is difficult. Hofmann constructs 'joints and marrow of soul and spirit,' a construction too harsh to need discussion. But whether the severing is of soul from spirit, and of joints from marrow (thus denoting its dividing power first in the spiritual, then in the bodily nature), or of soul and spirit from joints and marrow (thus dividing, as it were, between the spiritual and the bodily nature); or whether it is a dividing of the soul and a dividing of the spirit, and, if so, whether again joints and marrow are also separately divided, or whether these are added in apposition to soul and spirit (namely, soul and spirit—that is, the joints and narrow) are points not very easy to decide. Delitzsch inclines to the dividing of soul and spirit as one pair, expressing man's inmost spiritual nature; from 'joints and marrow,' another pair, expressing his inmost material nature. Others (as Bengel, Bleek, De Wette, Lünemann) take 'joints and marrow' as a sort of emphatic apposition of 'soul and spirit,' to wit: soul and spirit, even the very joints and marrow, the terms thus figuratively descriptive of soul and spirit, and added perhaps to accommodate the representation to the figure of a penetrating sword. As it is difficult to conceive a sword piercing through soul and spirit, the author gives concreteness and materiality to the idea by adding 'joints and marrow'; the 'joints' expressing the bonds of connection, the 'marrow' the most hidden and inaccessible part, and thus the whole expressing the piercing of 'the word' to the deepest recesses of the soul, and laying them open to the day. I think the 'joints and marrow' are appositional to 'soul and spirit,' and that in any case the dividing is not *between* different substances, but the cutting through each, as of successive layers. **And is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart** (κριτικός, *qualified to discern, discriminate, and judge*). The word of God rules with discriminating and judicial power within the province of man's inner nature. Penetrating our interior being, it sits in judgment on thought, purpose, and emotion. The sin of the Israelites consisted in that disobedience which originates in unbelief. The heart the author recognizes as the parent of sin, and this is reached and held under judicial cognizance and searching sway by the word of God.

13. This makes a natural transition from the word of God to him who utters it. **Neither is there,** etc.—or, *And there is no creature that is not manifest in his sight*—the 'his' (αὐτοῦ) referring to 'God,' not to the 'word.' None can escape his searching, all-penetrating eye, and his judicial and retributive action.

in his sight: but all things *are* naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do.
14 Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast *our* profession.

creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and laid open before the eyes of him with whom we have to do.
14 Having then a great high priest, who hath passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us

But all things are naked and opened—*laid open*,[1] with neck bent back, like Roman criminals, exposed publicly with bared and bent necks (Perizonius and Aelian, "Variæ Historiæ," 12 : 58); or, which I deem more probable, with head bent back, as animals slaughtered in sacrifice; or, perhaps, with no special archæological allusion, simply seized by the neck, barenecked, unveiled **unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do**—*with whom is our account or reckoning* (πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος), the *word*, *account* (λόγος) not having in this clause any reference to its use above. The whole passage is powerfully descriptive of the impression produced by a contemplation of the dealing of God with the ancient Israelites, and the danger of committing those sins of the heart in which consists the essence of apostasy.

14–16. Transition, by means of this exhortation, from Christ as Leader to Christ as High Priest.

14. The above discussion has enforced the need of religious fidelity and the danger of provoking the divine anger, and recalled our need of a High Priest who can aid our infirmities and interpose with his prevalent intercession between us and this God, whose word is so searching and whose judgments are so terrible. This furnishes an easy transition from Christ as Messenger of salvation (superior to the angels), and from Christ as Leader of salvation (superior to Moses), to Christ as High Priest of salvation (superior to Aaron). **Seeing then that we have,** etc.—better, as in the Revised Version, *Having, then, a great high priest who hath passed through* (not into) *the heavens—Jesus, the Son of God—let us hold fast our confession.* The connection of the 'then,' or '*therefore*' (οὖν) is not to the remote reference to the High Priest (2 : 17), but to what immediately precedes; and infers from that the need of holding on to their confession, while he calls up at once the only *condition* of this holding on; namely, their having an all-sufficient High Priest to intercede and to succor. The writer does not infer, from anything said before, the existence of the High Priest; but, exhorting his readers to retain their Christian fidelity, he assumes the high priesthood as an indispensable aid to its accomplishment. Still, while I do not think (with Lünemann) that the 'then' (οὖν) refers, primarily, to the 'having' (ἔχοντες), neither would I (with Delitzsch) regard it as exhausting its force on the verb, 'let us hold fast' (κρατῶμεν). It is partly (I think primarily) to be referred to the verb which exhorts them to their duty, but partly to the participle 'having' (ἔχοντες) as indicating their high prerogative in possessing this mighty spiritual ally. I may add, as a reason for the abruptness with which the writer introduces this participial clause, that in view of the terrible picture which he has just drawn, and which might well intimidate the most courageous heart, he *hastens* to present the brighter aspects of the case. He precedes the exhortation to fidelity by reminding them of the encouragement, as well as incentive, which they have to this. They have a High Priest who has atoned and can intercede for sinners—a *great* High Priest, mighty before and with God, *who hath passed through the heavens* (not *into*, but *through* them), beyond the limitations of the created universe, into heaven itself (9 : 24)—the absolute, the highest heavens; the absolute, ubiquitous presence of God; to the very right hand of God, where he sits as an equal, and thus completely competent to mediate between God and man. 'Jesus, the Son of God,' embraces both his natures—the one epithet marking his humanity, the other his divinity; the one the essential condition of his *being* a High Priest (5 : 1), the other of his High Priesthood being *availing*. As Jesus, he became lower than the angels, that he might taste of death. As Son of God, he was exalted infinitely above them, that his power might accomplish what his compassion undertook. Alike his compassion and his power, therefore, his humanity and his divinity, encourage us to 'hold fast our confession,' as against that terrible side of our relation to God presented by the fate of

[1] Τετραχηλισμένα, from τράχηλος, *a neck.*

15 For we have not a high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as *we are*, *yet* without sin.
16 Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.

15 hold fast our confession. For we have not a high priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one who hath been in all points
16 tempted like as *we are*, *yet* without sin. Let us therefore draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy, and may find grace to help *us* in time of need.

the ancient Israel in the wilderness, a side which, while urging to obedience, would drive us to despair. The 'confession' stands as representative of our entire Christian character.

15. This verse illustrates the gracious aspect of this character on the side of its humanity. **For we have not a high priest**—*who cannot be touched, who is not able to sympathize with*—**our infirmities.** The negative mode of statement is more forcible, because more full and formal, than the simple affirmative (we have a high priest who is able, etc.). It contrasts our position with the assumed dark alternative. The ability to sympathize[1] is a *moral* ability, derived from community of experience, especially in suffering. **But** *has been* **in all points tempted** (*tried*) **like as we are**—that is, *proved, tempted in all things, similarly to us.* The 'in all things' (κατὰ πάντα) declares the universality of his trials, not the completeness of the resemblance.[2] **Yet without sin**—equivalent to, *apart from sin.* This belongs not to 'tempted,'—equivalent to tempted without sin, either as cause or consequence; nor to 'in all things,'—equivalent to in all things except as to sin,—but to 'like as we are' (καθ' ὁμοιότητα), declaring that his temptation was after the likeness of humanity, except as to sin. From this element his temptations were exempt. "The participation of Jesus in every form of human suffering, the actual stirring of his impulses, his complete sympathy with our weaknesses, all the stern reality of his temptations, have yet found no slumbering principle of evil to which they could attach themselves." (Delitzsch.)

16. Close of this transition-passage, with an exhortation to avail ourselves for our needs of the aid of this great High Priest. **Let us therefore come boldly,** etc.—*approach with boldness*, with joyful confidence—**unto the throne of grace**—not the throne of Christ, but the throne of God, which, since Christ took his seat by his side, has become not only the "throne of Majesty," but the "throne of Grace"—a throne where grace is exercised, and whence it descends to us. The allusion is not to the earthly mercy seat, but to God's gracious throne in heaven. To this we may come in confidence, relying on the compassionate sympathy of our interceding High Priest. **That we may obtain mercy and find grace**—(in the original, a graceful chiasm). Mercy and grace express essentially the same quality under different aspects. '*Mercy*' regards us as wretched, sinful, victims of disease, sorrow, and death; 'grace,' *favor*, as helpless and without claim, objects of gratuitous and unmerited bounty. **To help in time of need**—that is, *for seasonable succor.* Some (as Bleek, De Wette, Lünemann) refer this to succor during the present time of grace, the 'to day' of the renewed promise. Better (with Tholuck, Delitzsch, Moll) refer it to our weakness and need of help in times of temptation, as in 2 : 18. Seasonable succor is the succor which our sympathizing High Priest, who has been himself tempted, brings to our seasons of temptations. The author has now launched fairly, in this transition, on that topic of the high priesthood of Christ which was his main destined theme. Each of the former topics has terminated in the high priesthood of Christ, and these have been almost hurried over to reach the main argument of the Epistle. In this Epistle, the sacrificial and intercessory priesthood of Christ appears as the central and vital fact of the gospel.

[1] Συμπάσχειν, *to suffer with*; συμπαθεῖν, *to sympathize with*, have community of πάθος, *affection, condition, suffering.*

[2] Καθ' ὁμοιότητα, *after the likeness, by way of similarity*, an expression weightier than ὁμοίως.

CHAPTER V.

FOR every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things *pertaining* to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins:
2 Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity.
3 And by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins.

1 For every high priest, being taken from among men, is appointed for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for
2 sins: who can bear gently with the ignorant and erring, for that he himself also is compassed with
3 infirmity; and by reason thereof is bound, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins.

3. CHRIST SUPERIOR TO AARON.

Christ, the High Priest of the New Dispensation, superior to Aaron, the high priest of the Old.

Ch. 5. (1) *Necessary qualities of the high priest.* (1–10.)

(*a*) He is taken from among men, that he, as man, may deal tenderly with men. (1–3.)

(*b*) He assumes the office, not self-appointed, but called of God. (4.)

(*c*) Christ received his priestly office from God. (5, 6.)

(*d*) In his fleshly nature as man, Christ wrestled with the fear of death, and, learning obedience from suffering, was perfected for his saving and priestly work. (7–10.)

(*a*) He is taken from among men, that he, as man, may deal tenderly with man. (1–3.)

1. For, introducing the *ground* of the preceding exhortation, and commencing the great priestly discussion of the Epistle by stating the necessary qualities of the high priest. **Every high priest**—all high priests without exception—(*being*) **taken from among men.** The participle here is not attributive ("who is taken," as if there might be priests that were not); but predicative, 'as being taken,' *since* he is taken. The necessity springs from the circumstances. Angels *need* no high priest, devils *can* have none, man alone needs him; and he **is ordained** (*constituted, appointed*) **for** (*on behalf of*) **men in things pertaining to God.** (The construction of the original is elegant and emphatic, "*from* men being taken *on behalf of* men is ordained") The author is not now contrasting our Lord's priesthood and Aaron's; both must be men—the Lord's incarnation is a pre-requisite to his priesthood. His office is in 'things pertaining to God.' He is middle man, mediator between man and God. **That he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins.** 'On behalf of men' is specialized into "on behalf of sins"—for their forgiveness and doing away. It is as sinners that men need a high priest, and this mainly for expiatory sacrifices. True, he offers for them, not merely bloody and expiatory victims, but thank offerings and gifts in general. This, too, is on account of the sinfulness of man, who, unfit to draw near to God, needs one who has at least a ceremonial holiness, and a special consecration to this duty. Still, no ceremonial holiness could ever be for a moment admitted, except as representing a real holiness lying in the background. 'Gifts' (δῶρα), offerings without slaughter, as drink- and thank-offerings. 'Sacrifices' (θυσίαι), slaughtered victims, involving blood and life. The offering of these appears as the substance of the high priest's mediatorial function.

2. Connected with and springing from the high priest's *human* character is his priestly qualification. **Who can have compassion,** etc., or, *deal gently*[1] *with the ignorant and erring.* A characteristic description of humanity in its twofold aspect of a darkened reason and moral depravity, and one in which the writer assumes half unconsciously the point of view of the human high priest, and gives an example of the leniency which he is describing. **For that** (*since*) **he himself also is compassed with infirmity** (περίκειται, *wears it as a garment, is clothed with it*). As knowing experimentally the infirmities of humanity, he is able to deal gently and sympathizingly with human frailty and error.

3. And—in fact, so far reaching is this infirmity—**by reason hereof he ought** (*is bound, is obliged*), **as for the people, so also for himself, to offer** (*make offering*) **for sins.** This verse, without being strictly a parenthesis, is yet parenthetical. It is added as an incidental expansion of the thought, 'is

[1] Μετριοπαθεῖν, *to moderate one's passions;* hence, "treat with moderation or indulgence," a word in common use with the later Stoics. It is not happily rendered by the Common Version, "have compassion upon."

4 And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as *was* Aaron.
5 So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee.

4 And no man taketh the honour unto himself, but
5 when he is called of God, even as was Aaron. So Christ also glorified not himself to be made a high priest, but he who spake unto him,
Thou art my Son,
This day have I begotten thee:

compassed with infirmity,' and is perhaps to be constructed with this under the influence of 'for that,' *since* (ἐπεί); "since he is compassed and is bound," etc., not as co-ordinated with 'ordained' (καθίσταται). The expression is thrown in to show how real and far-reaching was this human element in the priesthood. It went so far that the Levitical high priest had to offer sacrifice for his own sins as well as for the sins of the people. This semi-parenthetical character of the verse it is important to recognize. Make it prominent, and it presents the Levitical priesthood in contrast with that of Christ, while we look in vain for its antithesis in the delineation of Christ's priesthood. Regarded as incidental, and a merely heightening touch in the portraiture of the Levitical priesthood, whose essential humanity our Lord shared, and it needs no farther notice. It is just a momentary descent from the level on which he is here placing the Old and the New Testament priesthood; a momentary diversion from the straight line of parallel between them. No doubt, indeed, that a prerogative of Christ's priesthood is here suggested, inasmuch as he has been above declared to have been tempted in all points similarly to man apart from sin. Thus though, like the Aaronic priest, encompassed with infirmity, he had not, like him, to make expiation for his own sins.[1] **Ought** (ὀφείλει, *is bound*); both morally and legally, here perhaps there is no intended distinction.

(*b*) Christ is not self-appointed, but called of God. (4.)

4. And no man taketh, etc.; *And not to himself does any one take the honor, but* [*he takes it*] *being called by God, just as did Aaron.* Compare the Revised Version. If 'take' (λαμβάνει) has in the first clause the sense of 'arrogate,' or 'assume voluntarily,' it must be understood for the following clause in a modified sense as equivalent to receive (δέχεται). I think it has this modification. 'Aaron' is not put here for the priestly line sprung from him, but simply as its representative, as a personal, historical illustration of the statement. What was true of him was of course true of all; but it was specially proper to mention him, as in him the priestly line began, and in him the divine call stood out in special prominence. (Ex. 28:1.) This, too, like the preceding, is no arbitrary qualification. Obviously those who are to minister before the Lord on behalf of sinners must be chosen neither by themselves, nor by the guilty race that needs their intercession, but by him who is to be placated. A self-constituted, or a man-constituted, ministry before God must be without validity and without efficacy. The Being to be appeased can alone select the means and agents of the service.

(*c*) Christ received his priestly office from God. (5, 6.)

5. Having enumerated the essential qualifications of the high-priesthood, the author shows in reverse order that they are realized in Christ, and in their utmost completeness. The latter of the two is taken first. **So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest.** It is questioned here whether "glorified" (ἐδόξασεν) is equivalent to "taking the honor" of ver. 4, and is restricted to taking the priesthood, or points to that *kingly* exaltation which was the condition and accompaniment of his priestly dignity. So think many from the terms 'glory,' 'glorified,' which elsewhere describe his kingly exaltation (2:9), and from the following quotation, "Thou art my Son," etc., which points doubtless to his elevation as king, and not as priest. Yet it is hardly natural to deny Christ's assumption to himself of the priesthood by denying his assumption of the kingship, and as the term 'glorified' seems intrinsically as applicable to Christ's priestly as to his kingly dignity, the author might easily, in passing from the earthly priesthood of Aaron to the heavenly priesthood of Christ, use a more exalted term. **But he** (*glorified him*) **that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee.** This citation

[1] Περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, *concerning himself*, and περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν, *concerning sins*, are substantially the same as ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων and ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν, *on behalf of, in relation to*, although the prepositions are not precisely equivalent.

6 As he saith also in another *place*, Thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.
7 Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered

6 as he saith also in another *place*,
Thou art a priest for ever
After the order of Melchizedek.
7 Who in the days of his flesh, having offered up

does not, of course, prove the *bestowal* on Christ of the priesthood, but it most appropriately prepares the way for it. It shows that the kingship which was a condition of his priesthood was also bestowed, and thus leads to the natural inference that he received also his priesthood. By naming the bestower of the priesthood periphrastically as the one who exalted him to the heavenly Sonship, he strengthens his proof, and enhances the dignity of the personage who is the object of this double honor.

6. As he saith also in another place (Ps. 110 : 4), **Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.** This establishes the point. The priesthood of Christ was divinely bestowed. He did not deem the eternal priesthood, any more than the eternal filial equality with God, a thing to be rapaciously snatched or caught at (ἁρπαγμόν, Phil. 2 : 6), but came to them both in the path of humiliation and suffering, and he received them both as the reward of his lowly and faithful obedience. God called him to the priesthood as he called Aaron, but to a priesthood as much higher than was Aaron's as his person and work were nobler. *Where* his high-priestly work commenced, also, is not necessarily here intimated; it began, doubtless, on earth, though his formal and full high-priestly character appeared only after his exaltation. The words 'after the order' are not here to be pressed; they are explained in 7 : 15 by "after the likeness" (κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα). In some distinguishing points his priesthood resembled that of Melchisedec rather than that of Aaron; in fact, combining antitypically all the essential features of both.

(*d*) In his fleshly nature *as man*, Christ wrestled with the fear of death, and, learning obedience from suffering, was perfected for his saving and priestly work. (7–10.)

This priest, thus constituted by divine call, appears now invested with the *second* attribute of a true priesthood, a human experience which qualified him to sympathize with all the weaknesses and struggles of humanity. Instead of uniting this attribute with the preceding by *and* (καί), the author elegantly brings it into closer connection by the relative 'who.'

7. Who in the days of his flesh—when he had descended from his home in the bosom of his Father, when he had veiled his Deity in the garb of a true humanity. The 'days of his flesh' is an emotional and tender statement of the fact of the Redeemer's manhood. It reminds us of all the frailty, the temptation, the suffering, the death to which 'the flesh' is liable. With reference to our Lord the language has another peculiarity. With an ordinary man, 'the days of his flesh' would have a purely prospective reference; they would be relative to his subsequent spiritual condition. With our Lord they are both prospective and retrospective. They denote that *dip*, so to speak, from the level of his eternal Godhead, by which he temporarily descended from his infinite and purely spiritual height, in order to re-ascend to it with his glorified humanity. 'The days of his flesh,' then, have in the case of Christ a peculiar significance. They mark a period bounded on both sides by a high and glorious existence. With other men, being in the flesh is matter of necessity; it is the condition of their existence. With the Son of man it was purely voluntary; he *became* (not, 'was made') flesh. The author, again, does not say, '*during* the days (παρὰ τὰς ἡμέρας) of his flesh.' He is not going to portray the *course* of our Lord's earthly life, but only one single striking and representative scene in it. He selects as specially appropriate to his purpose the scene in Gethsemane, as illustrating with pre-eminent force both the conflict and the triumph by which our Lord acquired his moral perfection as high priest. **When he had offered up,** etc.—better, *offering up prayers (entreaties) and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and being hearkened to.* The terms 'entreaties' and 'supplications' have no essential difference of meaning; they are simply doubled for emphasis. The participles, 'offering up' and 'being hearkened to' (προσενέγκας εἰσακουσθείς), denote single, not habitual acts, and clearly point to a single scene. That scene is the agony of the

up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared;

prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him [1]from death, and having been heard for his godly fear,

[1] Or, *out of.*

Garden. There our Saviour prayed with strong crying to 'him who was able to save him from death,' and of course, as clearly indicated by this language, prayed that he might be saved from death. The description of God, as one able to save from death, derives its pertinency from the character of the prayer. With drops of bloody sweat falling from him he thrice prayed: "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." That this was the approaching death of the cross which, under the urgent temptation of Satan and the burden of human guilt rolled mysteriously upon him, now presented itself clothed in triple horrors, cannot, I think, be reasonably doubted. That the Evangelist does not mention 'tears' in his record of this midnight struggle constitutes no objection to our view. Such suffering could not have been without tears, and in that picture of agony and bloody sweat the mention of 'tears' would rather have weakened than heightened its effect. In the present brief reference, 'tears' form a natural element of the scene. Some, as De Wette, extend the reference to the Saviour's agonizing on the cross. But as there was then no prayer to be rescued from death, and as the words "being hearkened to" evidently point to some recorded and specific fact, it is better to limit it to the prayer in the Garden, in which Christ did actually pray for deliverance from death, and was answered with tokens of the divine approval. Besides, this scene of encounter with temptation, of wrestling with spiritual adversaries, is more pertinent to the writer's purpose than the mysterious sufferings of the dying hour. **And was heard,** etc. *Being heard from his godly fear*, or, *hearkened to from his pious reverence.* Such seems the natural force of the words, and sustained by the connection. Our Saviour prayed in perfect submission to his Father's will; his language and spirit were, "Not my will but thine be done," and therefore he was graciously listened to, and, so far as possible, his prayer was answered. Some, supposing that because he was hearkened to he could not have prayed to be delivered from dying, refer it to his being delivered from the *consequences* of death (ἐκ θανάτου, *out of* death), from remaining and going to corruption in the sepulchre, from which he *was* delivered. But we have no evidence that such was the nature of the Saviour's prayer, and the language here used does not require us to assume it. A prayer need not be literally answered to be proved acceptable to God; all that this involves is perfect submission to his will. Such was our Saviour's prayer, and though, from the nature of the case, it could not be granted, yet God testified his perfect approval of the filial and holy reverence manifested by his Son. He sent his Angel to strengthen him for the ordeal from which he could not release him; he accepted the atoning sacrifice which he made for sin, as he could not have done had it been mingled with any taint of imperfection; and crowned the demonstration by raising him from the dead and exalting him to his right hand as King and Priest forever. Here, however, the more immediate reference seems to be to the angelic aid which was vouchsafed to his filial piety, which, while fainting and almost overwhelmed by terror and temptation, yet exclaimed in absolute resignation: "Not my will but thine be done." The Father thus immediately demonstrated that the prayer was heard approvingly, and, though he did not grant the agonizing request, did all that he *could* do toward granting it by strengthening his Son for the conflict. The word used (εἰσακουσθείς, *hearkened to*), is singularly appropriate to the account in Luke; and this is one of the passages which in this Epistle remind us of that evangelist. (The use of ἀπό, *from*, equivalent to *because of*, needs no defense.) If there seems inconsistency in Christ's praying to be saved from the death which he came to suffer, in his wavering in regard to the act which was to consummate his redemptive work, we remember that he was a man; a man with all human weaknesses, except sin; a man open to temptations, and *here* pressed with such temptations as none has before or since encountered. That he could be driven thus to pray proves the

8 Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered;
9 And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him;

8 though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the
9 things which he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey him the

terrible force of the temptation; and that, driven into offering it, he still retained unfaltering submission to his Father's will, enhances to the utmost our admiration of his integrity. The billows of hell that went over him could not shake his perfect trust in God. On the other hand, to reduce his prayer to a request for what *could and would be* granted is to disembowel it of its characteristic merit. It was precisely in praying under almost resistless temptation for *what could not be granted*, and yet acquiescing completely in the divine decision, that his obedience displayed its lustre, that he earned his Father's approval; and only as thus understood does what the author proceeds to say of him in the next verse gain its full appropriateness and force.

8. Though he were a Son, etc. *Although being a Son, learned from that which he suffered obedience.* He prayed agonizingly to be delivered from the cup, yet acquiescingly drank it. The language implies a yielding to something from which his nature recoiled, and *against which he had prayed*—to the death, I think, which lay before him. The scene of the cross cannot be included in the "offering entreaties," etc., because it was in submitting to this that he learned obedience, and this lesson had been already learned. The battle had been already fought—the assaults of the devil been repelled, and the sins of men borne obediently to the cross.[1] If the Saviour prayed for deliverance from the *consequences* of death, for resurrection from the tomb, this could be granted him, and furnished no test of obedience. It was in acquiescence to the divine *thwarting* of his will that this had been learned. Rightly interpreted, then, the entire passage falls into harmony with itself and with the facts. With strong crying and tears (Mark 14:33, ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν; Luke 22:43, 44), he prayed to be delivered from the impending death with its horrors, and his filial fear and piety secured his Father's approval. Yet his prayer not being granted, he bowed to the divine will, learned obedience in his sufferings, and went cheerfully to the cross. The language, of course, is not to be taken with servile literalness. Christ was always obedient, and never had in him any taint of disobedience. Yet, like his people, he had to be tried in suffering; to submit to what revolted his nature, and to *develop* in suffering that spirit of obedience which in all other men would have in a sterner sense to be *learned*. In all respects, except sin and in the transcendent magnitude of his sufferings, he shared, and in sharing learned to sympathize with, the trials of his people. His immeasurably greater included their immeasurably less.

9. This verse closes this sketch of the *necessary* qualities of the high priest. Thus, **being made perfect**—or, *perfected:* internally, in all the attributes of a perfect high priest; externally, by going through temptation and death up to that glory to which he was to conduct his people (2:10)—**he became the author of** (*an*) **eternal salvation unto all them that obey him.** Ministering effectually in divine things, he did for men really what the Levitical priests did symbolically. There is a twofold allusion to the preceding verse. He prayed in vain to be saved from

[1] I do not believe that the scene of the crucifixion was a scene of any such convulsive outward agony as marked the struggle of Gethsemane. I greatly doubt if the 'strong crying and tears' of our author could be applicable to it. I believe that the great, terrible, decisive internal conflict was fought out in darkness and solitude. Our Lord's general subsequent manner seems to have been that of calmness and self-possession. On his way to the cross he pointed away from his trials to their own, the weeping daughters of Jerusalem. He uttered indeed one agonizing cry on the cross, "My God, my God," etc., but this in borrowed language, and, as I think, one single, simple, self-contained utterance of inward agony. Otherwise the utterances are different. He prayed for his murderers. He extended pardon to the penitent malefactor, promising him Paradise with himself. He says calmly: "I thirst." Crying with a loud voice, he committed his Spirit to his Father. The rendering of the Common Version, sanctioned, I am sorry to say, by the margin of the Revised Version, is utterly without probability—"When he had cried with a loud voice," etc., making the crying and the commending two separate acts. And this, I believe, is all the loud crying that the gospels attribute to Jesus on the cross. I cannot but believe his deportment there had a calmness and a majesty, even, that warranted the centurion's exclamation, "This was the Son of God!"

10 Called of God a high priest after the order of Melchisedec.
11 Of whom we have many things to say, and hard to be uttered, seeing ye are dull of hearing.

10 [1]author of eternal salvation; named of God a high priest after the order of Melchizedek.
11 Of [2]whom we have many things to say, and hard of interpretation, seeing ye are become dull of hear-

1 Gr. *cause*.....2 Or, *which*.

death, and yielded obedience to the denial. On the other hand, on all who obey him he bestows eternal life. As disobedience on his part would have ruined his atoning work, so disobedience on theirs will exclude them from its benefits. Again, he bestows eternal salvation who himself could not receive a temporal salvation. The infinitely lesser boon was obliged to be denied to him, the perfectly obedient; the infinitely greater boon he secures to their imperfect obedience. ("An eternal salvation" (σωτηρία) is contrasted with the temporal salvation (σώζειν) which he vainly prayed for.)

10. The necessary qualities of the high priest being shown, and their existence in Christ fully illustrated, the author, with characteristic gracefulness, glides round on the pivot of the present verse to what is to be the next great topic of the Epistle—the Lord's Melchisedec priesthood. This he first designedly introduces, and then pauses, with that in mind, to administer his next solemn lesson of rebuke, exhortation, warning, and encouragement to his all too-unfit hearers, before formally resuming and completing the great theme. **Called of God**—or, *Being saluted by God;* that is, as God received him on his ascension into the heavenly sanctuary, meeting him on its threshold, and, we may suppose, first declaring his Sonship, "Thou art my Son," etc., and then pronouncing him **a high priest after the order of Melchisedec.** 'After the order (or, *likeness*) of Melchisedec,' Christ was strictly a Priest, a royal Priest; he was *High Priest* in another element of his priestly character. As one who had offered an expiatory sacrifice, and with its blood now entered the heavenly holy of holies, he was the high-priestly antitype of Aaron. The author, by calling him "high priest after the order of Melchisedec," unites the qualities of both the priesthoods—the regal, untransferable, abiding priesthood represented by Melchisedec, and the expiatory, interceding priesthood symbolized by Aaron. With the one, he treads the heavenly courts in kingly majesty; with the other, he brings an efficient offering. But, about to enter on this lofty theme, the author is deterred by the reflection that it lies in that higher sphere of religious truth in which the spiritual sluggishness of his readers disqualifies them for following him. It belongs to that "wisdom" which the Apostle Paul reserves for "mature" (full-grown, τέλειοι) believers. His readers are not neophytes—they are backsliders; instead of advancing on the path of Christian faith and knowledge, and thus being prepared to enter on the deeper mysteries of the gospel, they have fallen back, and need to be confirmed in its elementary doctrines.

(2) *Long hortatory passage, suggested by the incapacity of the readers to enter on the profound discussion before them; namely, the priesthood of Christ.* (5 : 11–6 : 20.)

(*a*) Failure of the readers in that spiritual maturity which they should, by this time, have attained. (11–14.)

11. Of (*concerning*) **whom**—that is, Christ as Aaronico-Melchisedec priest; or, better, *concerning which* (taking the pronoun οὗ as neuter); namely, this priesthood—**we have many things** (or, *much*) **to say,** etc.—or, *our discourse is extended* (πολύς), *and difficult of explanation.* The "who" (or, "which") can scarcely refer to Melchisedec (as by many), of whom, in fact, he has very little to say, a single sentence comprising all that he has to say of his history, and three or four sentences, of his entire personality; while the many mysteries which the fertile brain of expositors has spun out of the brief statement regarding Melchisedec are evidently not in our author. He simply takes the Old Testament record regarding Melchisedec to illustrate the import of the passage in the Psalm, and we cannot conceive it possible that he should have paused on the eve of his most solemn and profound discussion, to chide his readers for ignorance respecting some curious and recondite subtleties regarding Melchisedec. It is the double priesthood of our Lord in which our author finds the core and centre of the gospel, and which he feels demands more than the sluggish ears and

12 For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which *be* the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat.
13 For every one that useth milk *is* unskilful in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe.
14 But strong meat belongeth to them that are of

12 ing. For when by reason of the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again [1] that some one teach you the rudiments of the [2] first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need
13 of milk, and not of solid food. For every one that partaketh of milk is without experience of the word
14 of righteousness; for he is a babe. But solid food is for [3] full grown men, *even* those who by reason of

1 Or, *that* one *teach you which* are *the rudiments*.....2 Gr. *beginning*.....3 Or, *perfect*.

feeble intellects of spiritual infancy. The high priesthood, in which each of the two previous sections has ended, has thus made all that preceded but

"A swelling prelude to the imperial theme,"

to which he was hastening to conduct his readers. **Seeing ye are dull,** etc.—*Since ye have become sluggish in hearing.* The words refer to the last preceding epithet, *hard of explanation*, not to the *much, ample* (πολύς), as if it were the dullness of his hearers that required expansion of the topic. In itself, it would be fertile in matter, and, of course, difficult of comprehension, except to advanced believers. His readers were dull of spiritual comprehension, expressed, figuratively and Hebraistically, by *hearing*. Sharpness or dullness of *vision* naturally allies itself with more or less of spiritual perspicacity—that of *hearing* with docility or intractableness of temper. And the readers not only *were* so, but, what is worse, had *become* so. They had been not merely stationary; they had retrograded. Once flourishing in their Christian life (6:10; 10:32), they had encountered trials which, failing to withstand, they had sunk below their earlier level, and were in imminent danger of spiritual shipwreck.

12. For when for the time (*for while on account of the time of your professed Christian life*) **ye ought to be teachers.** The law of the Christian life is progress—growth in grace and spiritual knowledge. The pupil of to-day should be the teacher of to-morrow. *Ye have need* (*again*, just as at the first) *that we teach you what are* (τίνα ἐστίν)—or, that one (τινά), *teach you the first principles of the oracles of God.* Lachmann—(τινά) *some one;* Tischendorf—(τίνα) *what are.* The sense is indifferent, and in grammar they are equally allowable. *What* (τίνα) may, as often, be taken as equal to "of what sort" (ποία), and, of course, it is to be so taken here. These Christians need anew to have the nature of those elements unfolded to them. For "elements" (στοιχεῖα), see Gal. 4:9; Col. 2:8, 20. There, however, the term denotes the Old Testament beginnings of God's culture of humanity, as contrasted with the riper truths of the gospel; here the more elementary, as contrasted with the more advanced truths, of the gospel itself. "Oracles" (λόγια, *words, utterances*) are in Acts 7:38; Rom. 3:2, the Old Testament revelations, whether directly regarding Christ or not; here they are God's entire disclosures regarding his Son. **And are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat** (or, *solid food*). A similar figure is found in 1 Cor. 3:2, with a difference in the Greek word for 'food.' The words 'babes' (νήπιοι), and 'full grown,' 'mature,' 'perfect' (τέλειοι), are common in the New Testament. The author enumerates, a little below, some of the more rudimentary doctrines (the milk of the word), while the doctrines of Christ's high priesthood belong to the truths which need the mature to grapple with them. They are too strong for the spiritual feebleness into which these Hebrews have fallen. Of course, their incapacity is relative, not absolute; otherwise the author would not proceed with them to the discussion.

13. For every one that useth (*partaketh of*) **milk**—whose proper nourishment is milk, and who, by consequence, is unable to bear other kinds of food—such is the characteristic of infants (νήπιοι)—*is without experience of the word* (or, *in a doctrine*) *of righteousness*—that is, a doctrine (λόγος) which treats of righteousness—which is the grand scope of the New Testament: or, a word or discourse of righteousness—(referring to the capacity for its utterance) like "a word of wisdom" (λόγος σοφίας), a "word of knowledge." So Delitzsch, who finds in this a covert antithesis to the *babe* (infant, not speaking, νήπιος) of the following clause, **for he is a babe**—unable to receive and digest the higher truths of the gospel.

14. But strong meat, *solid food* (*the higher, more difficult doctrines of the gospel*), **is for full**

full age, *even* those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil.

use have their senses exercised to discern good and evil.

CHAPTER VI.

THEREFORE leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God,

1 Wherefore leaving [1] the doctrine of the first principles of Christ, let us press on unto [2] perfection; not laying again a foundation of repentance from dead

1 Gr. *the word of the beginning of Christ*.....2 Or, *full growth*.

grown men (τελείων, *perfect, mature; who, because of habit* — moral state or condition acquired by use and training—ἕθος, *custom;* ἕξις, *habitus, habit*, abiding state, resulting from custom) **have their senses** (organs of sense, αἰσθητήρια, perceptive faculties, here, of spiritual perception) **exercised** (*disciplined*, trained gymnastically) **to discern both good and evil**—for the discrimination of the sound and unsound in religious teaching. The figure seems here wholly dropped.

Ch. 6. Exhortation, warning, and encouragement to the readers.

(*b*) To this condition of spiritual maturity just described the writer exhorts his readers to hasten forward, and not linger among the elements of the religious life. He alarms them with the possibility that their backsliding may become irretrievable, but assures them of his better and brighter hope for them. (1–8.)

1-3. Exhortation to quit the first principles of the gospel and advance to maturity.

1. Therefore (in view of the unsatisfactoriness of this state of spiritual infancy) **leaving the** (*first*) **principles of the doctrine of Christ** (the initial doctrine of Christ), **let us go on** (bear ourselves on, *hasten, speed onward:* such is the force of φερώμεθα) **to maturity.** It is questioned whether the advancement here urged is that of the *author*, quitting in discussion, along with his readers, the elementary doctrines of the gospel, and proceeding to the higher; or of his *readers*, leaving practically their state of spiritual infancy for the maturity so befitting their profession. Does he as an *author* exhort them to follow him to the higher points of Christian doctrine, or as a *spiritual teacher* urge *them* to higher spiritual attainments, using the plural "we" from modesty and conciliation? Partially, I believe with Delitzsch that both are implied. The words "leaving" (ἀφέντες, *letting go, quitting*), and "laying down" (καταβαλλόμενοι) as foundations, seem more especially appropriate to the course of a *discussion* in which writer and readers advance together from point to point, and lay down, or refrain from laying down, fresh foundations. But while the passage, as to form, opens in this way, its general character and connection clearly make it a practical exhortation. To this refer the words "therefore," "let us hasten," and "maturity" (τελειότης, which, used of a discussion, should be τὰ τέλεια, *the things which are mature*); the weighty "provided that God permit"—words too significantly solemn to apply to a mere discussion; and, above all, to the following verses, which show that if the writer began with some slight coloring of the *author's* exhortation to more advanced *discussion*, it is immediately merged in the teacher's and *preacher's* urgent summoning to higher practical attainments; to hasten indeed from a condition which is not only unsatisfactory, but alarming. The urgent 'let us speed on to maturity' marks danger that their present condition may become permanent, and indeed an apprehension that it may be already hopeless, and they like reprobate land given over to the burning. The appeal comes to them, like the angel's summons to Lot: "Up, get ye out of this place"; and I incline to think that ver. 8 has in mind the doom of Sodom. **Not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God.** The 'again' might apply to renewing the foundations in discussion, or renewing the foundations in practical life. The two ideas seem blended, as if he would say: "Leave these foundations of mere elementary truth; they belong to your primitive spiritual state. If they have been laid once, they need not be laid again; if they have been laid and abandoned, they *cannot* be laid again. *He*

2 Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.

2 works, and of faith toward God, [1] of the teaching of [2] baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resur-
3 rection of the dead, and of eternal judgment. And

1 Some ancient authorities read, even *the teaching of*.....2 Or, *washings*.

therefore will not stop to relay them in discussion, nor must *they* in life and practice. Not indeed are they to ignore and abandon them, but to assume them and speed forward. 'Foundation' denotes in 1 Cor. 3 : 11, Jesus, the ultimate foundation; here, the *proximate* foundation, the relatively fundamental truths of the gospel.

What this foundation, this elementary doctrine of Christ, is, the author now informs us. It is sixfold, distributed into three pairs, arranged in logical succession. The first pair is fundamental to the Christian life, 'Repentance from dead works'; not the works of the law, as dead works (Gal. 3 : 21; 4 : 9), but works which have in them no vitality; spiritually *dead*, and of course also *deadly*. Such, too, would be works of law when purely legal, merely formal, hollow observances. With repentance is connected "faith toward God," as its accompaniment and cause; the two, indeed, chronologically simultaneous; born together under the same quickening act of the Spirit.

2. The second pair of elementary principles pertains to rites of the church. **Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands.** There is here a somewhat difficult question of construction. A few (as Winer, Kurtz) construct "teaching" or "doctrine" after 'baptisms'; 'baptisms of teaching,' or teaching-baptisms—that is, baptisms followed by teaching (as Matt. 28 : 19, 20, baptizing, teaching). Others make 'baptisms' dependent on 'doctrine'—'the doctrine of baptisms'; while the majority, as Bleek, Delitzsch, Moll, etc., connect it equally with all the following nouns; as doctrine of *baptisms*, *of laying on of hands*, *of resurrection of the dead*, *and of eternal judgment*. I think it difficult to decide, and there may have arisen questions in the primitive church regarding baptism, as its relation to Jewish lustrations ("divers baptisms," 9 : 10), and to John's baptism, which did not arise in regard to the other points mentioned. On the other hand, all these great subjects, especially the resurrection and the judgment, may, and in fact must, often have demanded careful instruction. The plural "baptisms" refers, perhaps, to those various questions which would arise, especially with converts from Judaism or from John's baptism, as was the case with Apollos at Ephesus, where Apollos, "mighty in the Scriptures," but knowing only the baptism of John, was taught the way of God more perfectly. The imposition of hands, though not probably following regularly on baptism, had an important connection with the bestowal of spiritual gifts. The third class or pair of truths, 'Resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment,' though differing from the first in character (but more vital than the second), is equally fundamental. They evidently went deep, indeed, into the apostles' teachings and the life of the early church, as we see in the Epistles to the Corinthians and Thessalonians, and in Paul's discourse before the Athenian Areopagus. The resurrection of the dead was guaranteed by the resurrection of Christ, and stood in vital connection with it. (1 Cor. 15 : 15, 16.) The 'eternal judgment' is the final judgment, whose issues, unlike those of preceding judicial dispensations—the Flood, the overthrow of Sodom, the destruction of Jerusalem—are final and eternal. But how reconcile the declaration that these Hebrew Christians need to be taught anew the first principles of the gospel with the exhortation to leave them and hasten on to perfection. We reply that the language is in such cases relative and not absolute. They are not, on the one hand, conceived to be *totally* incapable of apprehending higher truths, nor on the other counseled to *forsake* the elementary. There is force in the present participle (καταβαλλόμενοι), *endeavoring to lay*, *busying themselves in laying* foundations. Regarded as *foundations*, they are to be laid once for all, and built upon as lying at the base of the Christian edifice. They are not disparaged, but exalted. Among these the 'laying on of hands' may with the ceasing of miracles have become of less moment. The rest retain their full primitive significance. Repentance, faith, baptism, the resurrection, and the judgment are grand pivots around which the whole Christian system revolves, in all ages, cardinal elements of Christian doctrine and life.

3 And this will we do, if God permit.
4 For *it is* impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost,
5 And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come,

4 this will we do, if God permit. For as touching those who were once enlightened [1] and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy
5 Spirit, and [2] tasted the good word of God, and the

1 Or, *having both tasted of . . . and being made . . . and having tasted, etc* .....2 Or, *tasted the word of God that it is good.*

3. And this will we do. (So Tischendorf, with Sinaitic, Lachmann. Bleek, Lünemann, Delitzsch, Moll—"Let us do," with no material difference in sense.) **If** (more emphatic, ἐάνπερ, *provided that*) **God permit.** That this is none of the commonplaces of deference to the divine will is shown both by the emphatically expressed condition, intimating that some obstacle *may* lie in the way, and by the nature of the duty to which it is affixed. A duty like that of spiritual advancement is usually urged, not *provided* that God *allows* it, but *because* God *requires* it. A condition, therefore, so emphatically expressed, appended to such an exhortation, implies something peculiar and extraordinary in the condition of the persons addressed. The writer has exhorted his readers to speed their way to the higher grounds of Christian maturity, and he sharpens his exhortation by reminding them that their effort may become soon, and has possibly become already, too late. The success, nay, the very existence, of their religious striving, depends on the divine approval and co-operation; if that be withheld, it will be unavailing. The doubt is not whether persons having apostatized from their former high religious condition could be recovered, but whether they have actually apostatized. If they are only in imminent danger of it, God will bless their and his efforts to restore them; if otherwise, their recovery is hopeless.

4-8. These verses assign the reason of the above ominous condition, 'provided that God permit'; for it is doubtful if God *will* permit, and depends on the degree to which your defection has advanced.

4. For—as to whether God will permit this advancement—**it is impossible**—not exceedingly difficult, a *quasi* impossibility, but from the inherent necessities of the case, or the laws of God's gracious economy, or both, absolutely impossible (so 10 : 26–38)—**for those who were once** (*once for all*) **enlightened**—at once brought into the light and endowed with spiritual vision. See 10 : 32, "And call to mind the former days in which, after ye were illuminated," etc., the latter passage certainly implying regeneration. **And tasted the heavenly gift.** 'Tasted,' not in contrast with a deep and full experience, but an elegant and enhanced expression of the idea of *experiencing*, enjoying, as at 2 : 9, "tasted death for every man." By transferring the idea to that bodily sense which ministers to our most vivid animal delights, the thought gains in force and vividness. 'The heavenly gift' is the boon of salvation, the saving grace of the gospel. **And were made partakers of the Holy Ghost.** Not merely of his miraculous, but of his enlightening and quickening influences (Eph. 1 : 13). "In whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise." Allusion, however, is probably made to the special and partly miraculous influences which in the early church so often followed upon conversion. (Ver. 4 may be constructed thus, "those once for all enlightened both by tasting and being made partakers," etc., the participial clauses defining instrumentally the elements of the illumination. The idea is but slightly different.)

5. And tasted the good word (*an excellent* word or utterance) **of God.** Not 'the good word of God,' as containing truth or doctrine (λόγος), but an excellent word, as something spoken (ῥῆμα), utterance, ordinance, decree, promise, very probably, here, some comforting promise of the future perfection of the kingdom of God.[1] **And the powers of the world to come** (*of the coming, or future age*, see 2 : 4; Gal. 3 : 5). Miraculous gifts and endowments mainly, which were a common characteristic of the early church, and which, in Old Testament times, were looked forward to as destined to mark the coming age (αἰὼν μέλλων), the age of the Messiah. (Acts 2 : 17, seq.) From the Old Testament point of view this coming age was already present. It had been ushered in with

[1] The genitive δωρεᾶς, of a gift *participated* in; the accusative ῥῆμα, of a word or utterance, of whatever nature received in its totality.

6 If they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put *him* to an open shame.

6 powers of the age to come, and *then* fell away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance; [1] seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God

1 Or, *the while.*

the Messiah, and those extraordinary spiritual effusions which followed his ascension. With his departure, the "coming age" divided itself, and its fullest powers were reserved for the second coming, and the kingdom then to be consummated. Of these more wondrous manifestations, the miraculous powers now exhibited were but types and presages. Both of the glorious present, however, and as foreshadowings of the still more glorious future, these Hebrew Christians had largely partaken. The above characteristics would seem to indicate Christians; and as the representation derives all its force from its applicability to the persons addressed, and as the author of the Epistle uniformly regards these as having been believers, we seem bound to suppose that such is the character here described. Whether such persons actually can or do fall away, is another question.

6. If they shall fall away—(*and have fallen away*, with emphasis on *and*), apostatized, "departed from the living God"—**to renew them again unto repentance.** Their recovery is hopeless; they have exhausted the resources of divine mercy. **Since they crucify** (temporal and causal participle, ἀνασταυροῦντας, *while and because of* crucifying) **to** (or, *for*) **themselves the Son of God afresh**—the Christ who has been crucified by others, they, after having accepted and believed in, recrucify for themselves. The present participle (ἀνασταυροῦντας) following the previous aorist participle, implies that their act of falling away, conceived as one and single, is connected with an abiding recrucifixion of the Lord. This continuousness of their act enhances its wickedness. The verb translated "to crucify again" (ἀνασταυροῦν), would, in the classics, simply mean 'to fasten up to a cross,' but the preposition (ἀνά) is exceedingly flexible and various in signification, denoting, in the same word, sometimes *up*, sometimes *back* or *over again*, and sometimes combining both. Here interpreters, from the Greek expositors down, have given to it the force of *over again.* By again turning their backs on Christ, these apostates sanction, and, as it were, renew his crucifixion; they lend their voices to swell the shout of "crucify him." They crucify him *for themselves* in that they make the national act their own, and declare their individual purpose to have nothing to do with him, and, at the same time, hold him up to the scoffing and derision of *others;* expose him to public shame and reproach (παραδειγματίζειν; *to make a public example of*).[1] This language would be especially forcible addressed to Jews whose countrymen had crucified the Messiah, and while yet the echo of that great shout of national rejection was still lingering on the ear, in which, in fact, some of those addressed may not improbably have participated. On these persons, therefore, the gospel has tried its utmost strength and failed. The only Being whose blood could redeem and sanctify them, they have discarded. There remains for them no more sacrifice for sin; and as matter both of natural necessity and judicial retribution, their recovery is impossible.[2] In

[1] See Matt. 1 : 19, Joseph . . . not willing to make a public example (παραδειγματίσαι, or, omitting παρά, δειγματίσαι) of Mary.

[2] The sin here described as sealing the ruin of its agents, is by many identified with the sin against the Holy Ghost described in the gospel. To me they seem, though equally fatal, widely different. *That* is the sin of open spurners of Christianity; of men who vent their hate and malice in words and acts of libel and outrage against the workings of the Holy Spirit; who, though they have had great external enlightenment, have made no pretence of discipleship. *This* is the sin of professed (and real) friends, who have been inwardly, as well as outwardly, enlightened, but slowly, and half unconsciously, under the deceitfulness of sin, have lapsed gradually into final, and utter apostasy. The former sin is committed more directly against the Spirit: the latter against the Son. The former is unpardonable, as being a wanton and spiteful rejection of him who *applies* the cleansing blood of Christ; the latter as exhausting and proving inefficient the resources of that blood itself. The one provokes and drives away the Spirit, and prevents him from applying his regenerating power to the soul; the other quenches his regenerating influences in the soul itself. In my opinion, there is another wide difference between them. The one can be, and is, committed; the other is, theoretically, but not practically, possible. The present passage describes, I think, a condition subjectively possible, and, therefore, needing to be held up in earnest warning to the believer, while objectively, and in the absolute purpose of God, it never actually occurs.

relation to this sin, I would remark: (1) That this, and several like passages in the Epistle, are substantially but expansions (couched in the peculiar style of our author) of similar exhortations and warnings occurring elsewhere in the epistles, emphasized, in this case, by the extremely perilous condition of the persons addressed. The Epistle to the Galatians furnishes, perhaps, the nearest parallel to their condition, though the accessories and handling are widely different. But the injunctions, "Quench not the Spirit," "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God," etc., and especially the Saviour's language in John 15: 7, seq., "Abide in me," etc., "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth," etc., seem substantially of the same nature. Whatever inferences we draw from the one set of passages can be extended to the other. (2) I think it is not affirmed in any of these passages, that persons of the class here described have actually fallen away. The readers are bidden to beware of an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God, warned of the helpless condition of apostates, and reminded of the intrinsically necessary consequences of such apostasy—granting it to occur; but I am not aware that the case is put otherwise than hypothetically. Why, then, put hypothetically a case which is never to be realized? I answer: (3) The Scriptures everywhere treat men as free, moral agents, who hold their destinies in their own keeping. The sinner is commanded to repent, as if repentance lay within his independent volition; the Christian is urged to fidelity, perseverance, and growth in holiness, as if all were not ultimately the product of divine grace working within him. They are dealt with, not according to the objective facts, but their subjective, conscious obligations; and this mode of dealing with them is doubtless one of the divine means of accomplishing its sovereign purposes. As free, moral agents, they may, and ought to, repent; but through these exhortations God brings them to repentance. As conscious, free agents, Christians may either stand or fall; and if in his gracious economy he has ordained that they shall *not* fall, these warnings may be among his means of accomplishing his ordination. This with all the more propriety, as they know not as yet with absolute certainty to which category they belong. To the Eye that sees the future as the present, and the hidden as the revealed, their character and destiny are already decided; but to them in whom dwell conflicting elements of character, who are begirt by temptations, and to whom the sole decisive test is perseverance to the end, these exhortations are always timely. (4) The writer may thus include under the same general description, two widely different classes—those who are actually regenerated, and those who, not really so, have gone through an apparent Christian experience. The two will be subject to substantially the same treatment, and only in the sequel will exhibit their real intrinsic diversity. The stony ground plants spring up more speedily and luxuriantly than the offspring of the good soil; but the rising of the sun, which warms and fosters the one, scorches and withers the other. Thus the professed disciples may be described partly as they are, partly as they appear. Those who fall away were, in fact, never genuine disciples; those who were genuine disciples will never fall away. (5) The question of the possible apostasy of believers it is not my province to discuss. I can only just say that it seems to me to lie within the nature of the case that those whom the Son of God has ransomed with his blood and regenerated with his Spirit, cannot be allowed afterward completely to apostatize. It seems to me to be allowing such a triumph to Satan as is insupposable, and directly to antagonize the words of Christ, "My sheep hear my voice; and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." So the triumphant language of Paul in the eighth chapter of Romans; and such seems to me to be the prevailing tone of the New Testament. (6) But finally, it is clear that if the Christian's apostasy is possible, he can apostatize but *once*. When the record which God has written on his heart is effaced, it cannot be inscribed there again. He will have no second opportunity to offer that outrage to an atoning Redeemer and a regenerating Spirit. This, and other like passages, put an extinguisher on the hopes of him who has succeeded in wresting himself out of the arms of infinite love, and surrenders himself again to the mastery of sin, is henceforth its slave and victim to the end.

7 For the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing from God:
8 But that which beareth thorns and briers *is* rejected, and *is* nigh unto cursing; whose end *is* to be burned.

7 afresh, and put him to an open shame. For the land which hath drunk the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them for whose sake it is also tilled, receiveth blessing from
8 God: but if it beareth thorns and thistles, it is rejected and nigh unto a curse; whose end is to be burned.

7, 8. Simile illustrating and enforcing the above warning, and pointing the condition, "provided God permit."

7. For the earth, etc.—*For land that hath drunk the rain that cometh oftentimes upon it.* This is the subject to which both the following predicates, bring forth and bear (τίκτουσα and ἐκφέρουσα), equally refer. It describes alike that which in its further culture receives the blessing of God, and that which has his curse. It is the condition of the dealing with both these classes of land that they should have drunk the rains, and had the culture of the husbandman, and shared equally the original means of productiveness. The term 'drinketh,' therefore, is not to be pressed as if it denotes a cordial, voluntary drinking, a glad reception of the rain in the one case as against a more passive reception of it in the other. The terms 'drinketh,' 'bringeth forth,' 'receiveth blessing,' 'is rejected,' all transfer to lifeless nature the life and accountability which belong to the subjects that the figure illustrates. The image is pregnant with vitality. **And bringeth forth,** etc.—*giving birth to, engendering herbage suitable for them for whose sake* (not, *by whom*) *it is tilled.* **Receiveth** (*partaketh of*) **blessing from God.** Those *for whose sake* the field is cultivated are not necessarily the workmen, but the owners (perhaps both); as in the case of Christians, the spiritual soil is tilled indeed by men, but *for* the Supreme Owner, God. The land which, having thus drunk the fertilizing rains, repays them with appropriate vegetation, receives the divine blessing. God smiles upon it, and permits and prospers its further culture. He brings the springing corn to maturity, and rewards the liberal vegetation of one year by a still richer harvest in another. The field is endowed with life, and receives in augmented beauty and verdure the reward of its fidelity. So the writer keeps steadily in view his emphatic 'provided God permit.' Its blessing is from God.

8. But that which beareth, etc.—*But when producing thorns and thistles, it is reprobate and is near to a curse, whose consummation is to be burned.* 'Bearing' ('Εκφέρουσα), *bringing forth, producing*, though not a word of disparagement, is a term of less dignity (and intentionally chosen as such) than 'bringeth forth' (τίκτουσα, *giving birth to*) of the preceding clause. 'Thorns and thistles' are already the product of a curse (Gen. 3:18), but here appear as its occasion. The writer keeps out of sight any previous inherent difference in the quality of the land to make his figure more perfect. Let it receive the beneficent rains and yield a suitable return, and it is blessed; let it produce thorns and thistles, and it is cursed. It is *reprobate* (ἀδόκιμος), *unproved, not bearing trial;* hence, *worthless, discarded*, a term again transferred from rational to inanimate nature, and chosen as specifically appropriate. As the nations (Rom. 1:28) *disapproved* (ἀπεδοκίμασαν) to hold God in recognition, God gave them over to an *unproved*, worthless, reprobate (ἀδόκιμον) mind. Esau having discarded his birthright (12:17), when he would recover it was *reprobated*, and no divine blessing smiled on his endeavor. So the land that has made so ungracious and perverse a return for the heavenly boon is discarded, reprobrated as worthless. The appended condition, "if God permit," rings in the author's ears. 'Near to a curse' is an expression chosen in tenderness, that the author may not extinguish hope in the readers. He would alarm, but not drive them to despair. He would show their case to be critical, but not hopeless. Even while producing thorns and thistles, the field is not utterly abandoned; the curse delays; the consuming fire does not yet descend, and the doubt implied in the 'if God permit' may have a happy solution. If the word translated 'end' in the Common Version (τέλος) be rendered *consummation*, the 'whose' (ἧς), *of which*, refers to 'curse'; if 'end,' it may equally well refer to land (γῆς). In the words, "whose end is for burning," Delitzsch suggests a possible prophetic anticipation of the approaching doom of Jerusalem. The Jewish vineyard was certainly now near to its burning. The spiritual eye must have discovered lurid clouds hang-

9 But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak.
10 For God *is* not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love, which ye have shewed toward his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister.
11 And we desire that every one of you do shew the same diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end:

9 But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that [1] accompany salvation, though
10 we thus speak: for God is not unrighteous to forget your work and the love which ye shewed toward his name, in that ye ministered unto the saints, and
11 still do minister. And we desire that each one of you may shew the same diligence unto the [2] fulness

1 Or, *belong to*.....2 Or, *full assurance.*

ing heavy on the horizon. The general reference of the figure is probably to a storm of fire and brimstone from heaven, like that which descended on the cities of the plain and doomed them to perpetual sterility.

(*c*) The brighter aspects of the case. The author would encourage as well as alarm. He declares to his readers his confidence that under God's covenant faithfulness better things await them; cites his oath to Abraham as a sure ground of confidence, and, reminding them of their hope which enters the heavenly sanctuary, and rests on the heavenly High Priest, thus brings his subject gracefully round to the starting point in the heavenly high priesthood of Jesus, from which he had digressed. (9–20.)

9. But, beloved, we are persuaded—not necessarily implying doubt or reluctant belief, but a belief which springs from evidence. (Rom. 8:38; 2 Tim. 1:5.) **Of** (*concerning*) **you.** 'Beloved' is a term of endearment, applied by our author only here, and here, doubtless, in view of the fearful rebuke just administered. **Better things of you**—better to the extent of being *connected with salvation;* better intrinsically; better in their final issue. **Though we thus speak**—doubtingly and alarmingly. He has spoken with fidelity and plainness; he has inflicted "the wounds of a friend," putting the worst aspects of their case in the hope of preventing his foreboding from being realized.

10. For God is not unrighteous to forget your work. As to their work, see 10:32; their endurance of affliction and persecution, and active and close sympathy with the persecuted. The author finds grounds for the assurance that God will not permit their final apostasy in the fact that his very *justice* is enlisted in their behalf, and in some sort pledged to reward their former fidelity and devotion. The Christian's best works, of course, give him no claim to salvation. But God suffers no intrinsically good act to go unrewarded; and although it was at his pleasure originally to institute or not his gracious economy, yet it being once instituted, his veracity and justice guarantee the fulfillment of his promises both to the Redeemer and his people. He encourages, therefore, his Hebrew brethren by a reference to their former, and indeed still continued, acts of Christian service (for external may not have kept pace with internal spiritual decline), and finds in God's *gracious justice* a guarantee of their ultimate salvation. **And the love which ye have shewed toward his name**—that is, toward himself; the 'name,' as outward symbol of the person, often stands forcibly for the person. The 'work' stands collectively for *works;* it takes their Christian activity as a whole. It is completed by 'love,' ('labor,' κόπου, is wanting in the best MSS.), without which all works, even acts of charity, as giving one's goods to feed the poor and one's body to be burned, are really worthless. The work and the love had here gone together. **In that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister** (*are ministering*). They have attested, and are still attesting, their allegiance to Christ by ministering to his people; primarily, perhaps, though by no means exclusively, in charitable contributions. No inference can probably be drawn from this passage as to the residence of these Christians, whether in or out of Palestine. Whether their contributions were to their needy fellow-Christians in any part of Palestine (as Jerusalem), or among themselves or elsewhere, the reference is quite too vague to warrant any conclusion. Jewish Christians in Rome might very well have been objects of charity.

11. Renewed exhortation. **And we desire that every one of you do show** (*feel*) **the same diligence,** *zeal;* not the same with one another, but the same which ye have shown in deeds of love and charity. **To**

12 That ye be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises.
13 For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself.
14 Saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee.

12 of hope even to the end: that ye be not sluggish, but imitators of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises.
13 For when God made promise to Abraham, since he could swear by none greater, he sware by him-
14 self, saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and

(*in respect to*) **the full assurance of hope** (πληροφορίαν), *completion*, *perfection* (Bleek, De Wette), or, *full and assured confidence* (Delitzsch and others), more in accordance with the usual New Testament sense of the word. (10:22; 1 Thess. 1:5; Col. 2:2.) **Unto the end**—whether 'shew unto the end' or hope 'unto the end' seems doubtful, and the difference in meaning is not important. In either case 'the beginning of their confidence,' their original hope and fervor, are to be maintained to the final issue. This is conceived not so much as the close of life as of the waiting period before the coming of the Messiah, which was expected to break upon them soon, and did so typically in the overthrow of their city and nation. Perhaps the 'end' is here conceived as simply the close of the probationary period, in whatever way terminated.

12. That ye be not (*may not become*, *prove*) **slothful**—*sluggish* (νωθροί), *dull*, *inert* of spiritual understanding and sensibility. They have been already said (5:11) to *have* become sluggish; but such epithets are of course always relative, and besides the Greek verb (γένησθε) may signify not only to become what they are not, but to prove themselves *what they are* (ἐγένοντο ἀνδρεῖοι, *they proved themselves brave*). **But followers** (*imitators*) **of them who through faith and patience** (μακροθυμία, *long suffering*)—the very qualities which these Hebrew Christians are called on specially to display; the faith which takes cognizance of the future (11:1), and the long suffering which, nerved by faith, withstands trials and temptations. **Inherit the promises**—not the *word* of the promise, but its *substance*, its realization. The present participle (κληρονομούντων) shows that not merely the patriarchs and the ancient worthies are meant, but the whole line of the faithful down to their own day. Not until the next verse is the general thought specialized to Abraham. At 11:13 we are told that these ancient worthies died without receiving the promises—that is, their fulfillment. How, then, can they be here declared to have inherited them? We reply: The former declaration is confined within the limits of their *earthly life;* the latter takes in the whole compass of their existence. Looking simply at his earthly career, Abraham obtained the promise indeed, but not its fulfillment; looking at his whole career, he obtained both. With God, who cannot lie, making the promise is equivalent to fulfilling it, and its full import will be realized in its own due time. We may further add that the coming of Christ brings at once the believers of all times, dead and living, into a richer experience of the promised good. Whatever their previous condition, they now inherit the promises, and that through the faith and patience of their earthly life. Between 'promise' and 'promises' (singular and plural) there is no marked distinction.

13. Example of Abraham. **For** introduces an illustration, on the one hand, of the promise and of the guarantee in God's faithfulness for its fulfillment, and, on the other, of the faith and long suffering which secured its realization. **When God made promise to Abraham**—'Abraham' (in the Greek) emphatic in position (for *to Abraham in making promise*, *God*, etc.). Some (as De Wette, Lünemann) render the participle "after promising," thus making the promise antecedent to the oath, and referring the promise to Gen. 17:4, seq., and the oath to 22:16, 17; but the coupling of the oath with the promise is specially important to the writer, and it is much better to refer the whole to Gen. 22:16, 17, where both appear in connection. The aorist participle will admit equally well of either rendering, *when he promised* (*on* promising), or, *after promising*. I adopt unhesitatingly (with Delitzsch) the former construction, which makes the promise and oath come together, the promise preceding simply in logical conception. **Because** (*since*) **he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself.** On the part of God, Abraham's ground of faith was of the most decisive conceivable character. He left nothing undone that could assure to Abraham the sincerity and absolute reliableness of his promise, and added to it the inviolable sanctity of the oath.

14. Saying, Surely (ἦ μήν), a formula familiar to classic Greek, as accompanying and

15 And so, after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise.
16 For men verily swear by the greater: and an oath for confirmation *is* to them an end of all strife.
17 Wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed *it* by an oath:

15 multiplying I will multiply thee. And thus, having
16 patiently endured, he obtained the promise. For men swear by the greater: and in every dispute of
17 theirs the oath is final for confirmation. Wherein God, being minded to shew more abundantly unto the heirs of the promise the immutability of his

often taking the place of an adjuration, and always having the power of an oath; so the Septuagint.[1] The rest of the passage has the Hebrew emphasis **blessing I will bless thee**—equivalent to, I will surely bless thee, **and multiplying I will multiply thee**—equivalent to, I will surely multiply thee. The citation varies from the Septuagint 22: 17, in substituting *thee* (σέ) for *thy seed* (τὸ σπέρμα σου) in the second clause.

15. And so, *thus*—that is, not "in this way," but (by a familiar use of the Greek οὕτως) 'under these conditions' of God's promise given and confirmed: the particle 'thus' belonging exclusively neither to the participle "patiently enduring" (μακροθυμήσας) nor to the verb "obtained" (ἐπέτυχεν), but to both as constituting one complex idea. **After he had patiently endured** (*patiently enduring*, Rom. 4: 18-29; or, *by patiently enduring*) he **obtained the promise**—that is, its fulfillment. Not, indeed, in his earthly life time, but as fast and as soon as the promise in its various elements, the multiplication of his seed, and the Messianic salvation through his seed, could be accomplished.

16. For men, *indeed* (μέν, *indeed, to be sure*, as contrasted with God; never as the Common Version, **verily.** But the particle is wanting in the Sinaitic and some other MSS. If the particle is genuine it implies the latent thought that than God there *is* no greater.) **Swear by the greater** (τοῦ μείζονος)—either neuter, *that which is greater*, or better, masculine, "the greater Being," him by whom all men swear; namely, God. The force of the oath consists not in its appealing to *any* object greater than ourselves, but to the *one* Being who can take cognizance of our treatment of the oath. The last clause may be rendered: *And of gainsaying the oath to them is a finality (a limit) for confirmation.* 'Gainsaying' (here the object in the writer's mind being the divine promise) seems a better rendering of the Greek (ἀντιλογία), than *strife, dispute*, which the word will equally well bear, and as in the Revised Version. 'Oath' is emphatic in position. 'For confirmation' belongs to 'end,' 'limit,' and not to 'oath.'

17. Wherein (*in which*); namely, matter, or state of the case as to the force of the oath. **God willing** (*wishing*) **more abundantly**—in a higher degree than by his single word, or, as is possible, *very abundantly*—**to shew unto the heirs of promise**, not merely the Old Testament saints (Tholuck), nor simply Christians as such (Lünemann), but the spiritual descendants of Abraham, the spiritual Israel who inherit all the spiritual blessings couched under the earthly promise. In the promise to Abraham were potentially contained all the blessings of the New Covenant, whence believers become 'the heirs of promise.' An emphasis, however, rests on 'heirs,' as if the author would not only signalize God's desire to assure the blessing to Abraham, the original receiver of the promise, but to his children its inheritors, by a like oath. The author's circle of vision has expanded. He embraces in thought the present time, and the more strictly spiritual import of the oath to Abraham. **The immutability of his counsel,** etc., *interposed with an oath;* 'interposed,' *mediated* (μεσιτεύω), came as mediator between himself and the objects of the promise. It may be doubted whether Delitzsch (with some others) is not right in supposing that in this renewed reference to the oath at ver. 17, the author has not in mind another oath in which the New Testament heirs of the promise are still more deeply interested, that, namely, which confirms to Christ yet more solemnly the royal and perpetual priesthood of Melchisedec. The very formal resumption of the subject: the words "wishing more abundantly to confirm" (περισσότερον) which in this case would refer to the second oath—more abundantly than by the

[1] [The reading εἰ μήν is preferred by the leading editors, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, and is supported by the important MSS. ℵ A B D* E P. The meaning, however, is not affected by this change. See Thayer's Lex. of the New Testament S. V.—A. H.]

18 That by two immutable things, in which *it was* impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us:
19 Which *hope* we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the vail;

18 counsel] interposed with an oath: that by two immutable things, in which it is impossible for God to lie, we may have a strong encouragement, who have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us;
19 which we have as an anchor of the soul, *a hope* both sure and stedfast and entering into that which is

1 Gr. *mediated.*

former: 'the immutability of his counsel,' which might be suggested by "the Lord swore and will not repent"; and finally, the close connection in which all this stands with the heavenly sanctuary, in which the believer's hope is to enter and fasten on the high priesthood of Christ, toward which the author is now rapidly hastening forward, and which already he has full in view—all might favor the idea that he has now rather in mind the oath to Christ than the oath to Abraham. That special topic and example he seems really to have left behind him. His own times and his Hebrew brethren are under his eye. To them the oath that God would bless Abraham and multiply his seed, though always of interest, is now of less immediate concern than that promise and oath of God to Christ, which form the very core and centre of the New Covenant. And although there is here no express mention of this oath, yet it might be a part of the writer's *art* to leave it to suggest itself, as it so naturally would to his readers, and reserve its express mention to a little later on. (7:20-22.) As, however, the author *has not* here made express reference to this oath, I do not feel at liberty to give this as a confident interpretation, but suggest the probability that such is here the purpose of the writer.

18. That by two immutable things—in the promise and the oath; both equally and absolutely sure: for, strictly speaking, God's promise is his oath. His promise pledges his divine veracity, and all the attributes of his nature; and his oath can do no more. He condescends, however, to human weakness, and subjects his utterances to the law of our finite limitations. The added formula of an oath *seems* to be pledging the divine veracity more completely to the fulfillment of its promises. We may add, however, that even with men the distinction between the word and the oath is only seeming. To the *faith* that utters everything under the eye of Omniscience, every word has the sanctity of an oath —**in which it was** (*is*) **impossible for God to lie** (*utter falsehood*). Both the promise and the oath equally pledge the divine veracity: it is only our finite weakness that superadds to the sanctity of the promise the sanctity of the oath. *We may have a strong encouragement* (not as in Common Version, *consolation*) **who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set** (*lying*) **before us.** So, I think, better than "that we who have fled for refuge, may have strong encouragement to lay hold of," etc. Though it is doubtful if the elliptical construction should not be thus filled up: "may have strong encouragement *to hold on* (κρατεῖν), who have fled for refuge to *lay hold of*" (κρατῆσαι, aorist). *Lay hold of* (κρατῆσαι) suits much better to the 'who have fled for refuge' (οἱ καταφυγόντες). Both the clauses stand harshly alone. The 'hope' that lies before us is here taken objectively, as the thing hoped for, not the *grace* of hope, as just below; as Rom. 8, "a hope that is seen is not hope," plays between the subjective and objective uses of the word.

19. Which [hope] **we have as an anchor of the soul.** The anchor of hope is a natural and familiar figure, perhaps suggested here by the 'fled for refuge' (καταφυγεῖν), like a tossed ship fleeing for refuge to its harbor—**both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the vail.** These predicates (on account of the connections τε, καί, καί) must all be construed together. They are generally taken with 'anchor,' to which 'sure and steadfast' are especially appropriate; 'entering,' etc., less so. This applies beautifully to the believer's hope, less naturally to the 'anchor.' The figure, indeed, is not without force and beauty which represents the anchor of hope thrown not downward into life's stormy sea, but upward into the tranquil deeps of the heavenly sanctuary, where (unlike the earthly anchor) it *lies*, holding the spiritual bark through all its stormy course. Granting freely the picturesque beauty of this figure, I yet see nothing in the *position* of the words

20 Whither the forerunner is for us entered, *even* Jesus, made a high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.

20 within the veil; whither as a forerunner Jesus entered for us, having become a high priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.

CHAPTER VII.

FOR this Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him;

1 For this Melchizedek, king of Salem, priest of God Most High, who met Abraham returning from the

to prevent their being connected naturally with 'which [hope],' a figure that more easily suits to the 'entering within the veil.' In either case it forms an admirable turning point or pivot on which the author gracefully swings round to his main theme, from which he had diverged at 5 : 10, with a reference to Christ's Melchisedec priesthood, and to which through the intervening stages, by carrying the believer's hope into the heavenly sanctuary, the home of that royal High Priest, he now returns.[1] The writer adds most naturally, and returning to the topic dropped at 5 : 10—

20. Whither, etc.; *where* (ὅπου, *where*, used pregnantly for ὅποι, *whither*; equivalent to *whither* he entered and *where* he remained)—*as a forerunner on our behalf entered Jesus.* It is the presence of Jesus within the vail that emboldens our hope to penetrate that mysterious and awful place in which we "draw near to God"; and looking back from this point we feel more inclined to regard the oath, which at ver. 17 gives such strong assurance to the heirs of promise, as at least intended to call up to the mind of the reader the great Melchisedec oath and promise which, though he might reserve it for a fuller mention elsewhere, he could scarcely leave entirely unnoticed here. I think he lets it lie faintly outlined on the horizon of his thought. **For us,** *on our behalf.* In this Jesus resembled the earthly high priest, who, after slaughtering the victim in the outer court, entered with its blood on behalf of the people into the Holiest of All, the symbolical presence of God. But there the parallel ends. The earthly priest entered alone but once a year, and with none to follow. Jesus entered to *stay*, and as *Forerunner* of his people: that where he is they might be. *After the order of Melchisedec becoming a high priest forever.* This formally launches the author on his great theme. '*After the order of Melchisedec,*' in reversed order, is placed emphatically first as the topic which is to be immediately treated. After the likeness of Melchisedec he thus appears as royal, sole, perpetual Priest; after the likeness of Aaron, he becomes a High Priest; the author here again, as at 5 : 10, including the Levitical element, which gives to his priesthood completeness. As antitype of Melchisedec he would have a royal, untransferable, unending priesthood, but a 'barren scepter' and a barren priesthood, with no atoning sacrifice. As antitype of Aaron, he has a real efficacious sacrifice in the true tabernacle: and absorbing into his person the significance of both these priesthoods, he holds them both *forever.*

Ch. 7: (3) *The royal Melchisedec priesthood of Christ.* (1–28.)

(*a*) Summary of the Old Testament description of Melchisedec in those historical features which determine the character of his priesthood. (1–3.)

1. For this Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the most high God. There has been much speculation regarding this mysterious personage, who in the narrative of Genesis flashes a moment on our view, as one peculiarly exalted, and then utterly disappears, except, in one brief sentence of the Psalms, as priestly type of the Son of God. There has been expended on him much idle conjecture. He has been supposed to be Shem; to be a man created for the express occasion; to be an angel—nay, as if to convict the Scripture of the folly of likening our Lord to himself, and making him a priest after his own order, to be the Son of God himself. Every such hypothesis may be summarily dismissed. There is nothing, either, in the text of Genesis, or the commentary in Hebrews, which, properly considered, countenances such assumptions. On his origin and history the vail was evidently not intended to be lifted. Raised up for a special purpose, his origin and

[1] The passage furnishes one of the instances of graceful and designed transition, so familiar to our author, and which, like numberless other rhetorical touches, mark unmistakably a hand other than that of Paul.

end shrouded in intentional obscurity, he was brought into personal contact with the father of the Jewish race, that when a change should be necessary in the Jewish priestly order their own annals might foreshadow and justify the proceeding in the exhibition of one before whom Abraham himself, and in him his priestly descendants, had bowed in homage. So at least God has *used* Melchisedec, and so we may presume he *intended* to use him, and that to this use the Old Testament narrative was adjusted. Whatever the sacred historian may have known, or not known, regarding Melchisedec's ancestry and historical relations, the Spirit of God that presided over the narrative caused just so much to be recorded as answered the purpose of his introduction. He was to be used simply as a *type*. It mattered not so much what he *was* as what he *appeared*. The mode of exhibiting him met all the purposes which he was to subserve in sacred history. His *role*, however, in the historic drama, though brief, was one of pre-eminent dignity. He was an earthly king, probably, in that city which was subsequently to be the royal city of David, and of David's royal line. He was a priest, the first priest mentioned in the sacred annals, and a priest of the Most High God. Thus he was one of the few who still preserved uncorrupted the traditionary monotheism of the ante-Noachian period. Probably, he was one of that race of Shem that, as descendants of Lud, occupied Canaan before its conquest by the Canaanites, and thus belonged to the family which had received the peculiar blessing of Noah. Inferior to Abraham in his personal (though not in his official) future, he was superior to him in the actual present. Abraham's hopes and prospects were in the bud; Melchisedec's greatness was in its full maturity. Abraham was a king in embryo, the father of kings, the father of priests, the ancestor of him with whom a typical connection should alone rescue the name of Melchisedec from oblivion. But as yet all this was not, and Melchisedec now stood before Abraham in the combined dignities of actual kingship and priesthood—two persons unconsciously confronting each other, the one the real ancestor, the other the typical representative, of that Greater One in whom each was to find all his significance and all his greatness!

The long, swelling period which opens the chapter divides itself into two parts. The first consists of clauses describing the subject, Melchisedec, and is a mere *résumé* of the facts stated in Genesis. The second (commencing with, **being first,** etc., ver. 2) consists of clauses referring to the predicate (**abideth a priest,** etc., ver. 3), and declares under what character and conditions he so abides. The first identifies the *man;* the second portrays the *priest*, and is the author's statement of those points (as deduced from the narrative), which made Melchisedec's priesthood a type of our Lord's. 'For this Melchisedec'—the 'for' connects the passage directly with the preceding, and as it terminates emphatically with "abideth a priest continually," has probably in mind the "forever" which closes the preceding chapter. 'King of Salem.' On the locality of this 'Salem' opinions differ. Many claim that the city of David did not at this time bear this appellation, but that of *Jebus*, and that some other place, probably the Salim near Enon, mentioned in John 3 : 23, is referred to; and here, according to Jerome, were pointed out extensive remains of Melchisedec's palace. This, however, may safely be attributed to the local ambition, which took advantage of the coincidence of a name, while tradition, Josephus ("Antiquities," I : 10, 2), the Targumists, and most of the Fathers, identified it with Jerusalem. The name *Salim* for Jerusalem, occurring in one of the late Psalms (76 : 2), may, as well remarked by Delitzsch, be such an archaism as poetry loves, and may be the then nearly obsolete and therefore poetic ancient name of the town. To Bleek's objection that, if our author had referred to Jerusalem, he would have urged the sacred associations of the place, we may reply that such expansion would have been inconsistent with the studied brevity of the passage, while the hint of the significance of the name might well be deemed sufficient. On the other hand, the intrinsic probabilities are all in favor of assigning the typical King of Righteousness and Peace to the locality whose name was to be associated with the typical and then with the spiritual capital (12 : 22; Gal. 4 : 26; Rev. 21 : 2) of that kingdom forever. That the author takes the word in any other sense than as the name of a place is improbable. 'Priest of the most high God.' The union of kingly and priestly offices be-

2 To whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; first being by interpretation King of righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is, King of peace;
3 Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but

2 slaughter of the kings, and blessed him, to whom also Abraham divided a tenth part of all (being first, by interpretation, King of righteousness, and then
3 also King of Salem, which is, King of peace; without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but

longed to the simplicity of early times, and was common among the heathen. The Homeric king officiates likewise as priest. The knowledge of the Supreme God had not, it seems, entirely disappeared, and his worship existed sporadically, even down to a much later time, although, as in the case of Balaam, often incongruously blended with idolatrous rites and errors. Melchisedec was clearly recognized by Abraham as worshiping the same God with himself. **Who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him.** The fact here mentioned is more than a mere incident recorded to complete or give definitness to the picture. It has a purpose here, as doubtless this specific conjunction of events had in the original transaction. God not only brought Melchisedec into contact with Abraham, the head of the Jewish race, rather than with any other Old Testament worthy, but with Abraham at the precise period of his history, when, having avenged five kings and conquered four, he was returning in the flush of victory, and laden with the spoils of triumph. With his feet just taken from the necks of vanquished monarchs, his recognition of Melchisedec's superiority would be doubly significant.

2. To whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; namely, the spoils. Abraham did this voluntarily, and probably with an instant perception of a certain majesty attending the royal priest. The homage, however, was paid to the priest, not to the king. It was a religious offering, not a political tribute. It shows also how early and natural was the rendering of the tenth. Thus far we have a summary of the *facts* of the narrative.

The author now proceeds to comment on them in their bearing on Melchisedec's priesthood, as illustrating that of Christ. The inferences are partly positive, partly negative; partly drawn from the statements, partly from the silence of Scripture. They show under what conditions Melchisedec may be said to have had a perpetual priesthood. They are simply the author's deductions from the brief account in Genesis, and imply no knowledge of him outside of that account. He has looked to the Psalm, "Thou art a priest," etc., and then turned back to Genesis to see the features of that priesthood which had so wonderful an exaltation; what in Melchisedec's person, position, and office, would shed light on this remarkable declaration. He passes in rapid review the points. His name, the name of his city, his kingly and priestly office conjoined, his solitary personality and priesthood, both exhibiting no antecedent and no succession; thus what is told and what is suppressed alike constitute grounds of his relation to the great High Priest of the New Covenant. The author is simply *interpreting Scripture*, and his interpretation is a striking example of what spiritual insight can legitimately deduce from the language and the silence of a text. It has no analogy to the fanciful deductions of the Rabbins. **First being by interpretation King of righteousness**—that is, his name being by its interpretation, etc. Josephus explains it "righteous king"; our author probably conceives it, in its application to Christ, as 'king in the realm of righteousness.' **And then also King of Salem, which is King of peace.** Another typical feature in his portraiture, derived from the city in which he reigned. As applied to Melchisedec, it would denote simply 'peaceful king'; to the Messiah, 'king in the realm of peace,' which he first creates between man and God (Rom. 5:1); then inwardly in the soul (John 14:27); then outwardly among men, and finally universally in the world.

3. The deductions *e silentio*. The preceding points are rather incidental, and would not be pressed; the next are vital, giving the distinctive character of Christ's priesthood. **Without father, without mother, without** [*record of*] **descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life.** These epithets apply to Melchisedec, not as a priest, but as a man, and are the traits in his personal history on which rests the peculiar character of his priesthood. Because he *personally* appears before us with no records of origin or of death, therefore he can appear as having an

made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually.

made like unto the Son of God), abideth a priest continually.

unborrowed and hence untransmitted, unsuperseded priesthood. As to the import of these affirmations, they stand or fall together. If one demands an interpretation such as throws a *real* mystery about Melchisedec, all do. If one may be taken to express the impression made by the silence of the historian, all may. That this latter is the correct view, is now generally admitted, and I conceive to be beyond a doubt. The writer has no interest in involving in mystery the person of Melchisedec. He puts strongly certain points *for the use which he wishes to make of them* as illustrating certain features in the person, and hence the priesthood, of his antitype. What Christ is really, Melchisedec must be apparently; and this is all that is required. In a historical narration, which makes in general great account of parentage; in which genealogical tables are constantly given and at great length, and scarcely a sacred name is mentioned without a scrupulous record of ancestry and of end,—he, the greatest of them all, has no such mention. No father, no mother, no ancestry, no birth, no death, is recorded of him. He stands, a solitary instance of a personage whose function transcends that of every other Scripture character, type of the eternal kingship and eternal priesthood of the Son of God, yet—or rather, therefore—with not one word to shed light on his family or his nation, his reign, or his destiny. The remarkableness of the phenomenon warrants the inference that the silence is intentional and significant. Had the epithets appeared in the original *narrative*, the case would have been very different: but a commentary on the reticence of Moses is quite another matter; the question is not of a historical fact, but of an expressive symbol. Nothing turns on the question whether Melchisedec was really the miraculous person which these epithets, if pressed, would make him. The *seeming* is, for the typical use, as good as the reality; the non-appearance is equivalent to the non-existence, and here emphatically, "*de non apparentibus et de non existentibus, eadem est ratio.*" The import of the several predicates is obvious. He is one of whom no father or mother is recorded (a similar idiom is familiar to the classics—*nullo patre*), with no genealogical record (which is in fact the meaning of the word), and having in history no beginning or end of life. The words are *selected:* no "end of life"; therefore, he *liveth.* **But made like** (*assimilated*) **unto the Son of God.** This refers to the preceding clauses, especially the last, in which he appears as having neither beginning of days nor end of life. It is the summation of these statements. As one who *appears* exempt from the limitations of mortal life, from its beginning and its end, Melchisedec has been conformed, assimilated to the Son of God. This refers not to our Lord *in his human nature*, for as such he was not without parentage, genealogy, recorded beginning of days, and even end of life—at least, death; nor to him as *high priest* after his exaltation (for as such Christ was assimilated to him, not he to Christ); but to the Son of God in his eternal, pre-existent nature as the Only Begotten. The comparison, then, is not between Melchisedec as priest, and Christ as priest, but between those features in the *recorded personality* of Melchisedec, which *enable* him to *appear* as perpetual priest, and those attributes of the Son of God which enable him to *be* an eternal priest. A basis for Melchisedec's unborrowed and untransmitted priesthood is found in his appearance in the sacred page with a life which has no defined limit at either extreme, and is bound to the human race by no recorded genealogy; just as the eternal existence of the divine Logos was the basis on which could rest his absolutely untransmitted and eternal priesthood. The latent argument is: Melchisedec appears in his personality assimilated to the eternal Son of God; hence, he could have a priesthood which should typify the exalted and everlasting priesthood of the Son of God. Looking at the brief passage in the Psalm, and then at the brief passage in Genesis, the author has spelled out from the latter, with the divining sagacity of inspiration, those characteristics of Melchisedec which raised him to so exalted an office as that in which the Psalm exhibits him. Under these conditions, and by virtue of these qualities, Melchisedec **abideth a priest continually** (*perpetually*). He has, so far as appears, no successor. He had, probably, none in fact, being in no priestly line, and his

4 Now consider how great this man *was*, unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils.
5 And verily they that are of the sons of Levi, who

4 Now consider how great this man was, unto whom Abraham, the patriarch, gave a tenth out of the chief
5 spoils. And they indeed of the sons of Levi that re-

priesthood terminating with himself. Hence, as he does not *appear* as dying, his priesthood does not appear as terminating. That it must in reality have terminated is clear, else we have the monstrosity of two eternal parallel priesthoods, the typical and the antitypical. To suppose with some that he 'abides a priest perpetually' by his priesthood being absorbed into that of Christ is to make a vicious circle of argument; for Christ is Priest after the likeness of Melchisedec, because Melchisedec has a perpetual priesthood; and Melchisedec has a perpetual priesthood only as it is perpetuated in that of Christ. Melchisedec, then, is perpetual priest as one who has no successor, and does not appear as dying. The author, too, chooses his terms with care. He does not say of Melchisedec that he abides a priest *forever;* this absolute expression he reserves for Christ. The phrase 'perpetually' (εἰς τὸ διηνεκές) may mean 'forever' when its subject would naturally take such a predicate. The Greek, like its English equivalent, takes its extent from the subject to which it is applied.

(*b*) Personal greatness of Melchisedec illustrated by his receiving tithes from Abraham, and that under extraordinary conditions. (4–10.)

Christ as priest after the order of Melchisedec has superseded the Levitical priesthood. It becomes pertinent to inquire, especially for Jewish readers, how great a person this type was, not only typically, but personally. This section is often misconceived, as I think, by being regarded as commencing the enumeration of Christ's priestly prerogatives, as Melchisedec Priest. This point is not yet touched; we have simply the personal and official greatness of Melchisedec himself. I have already remarked on the obvious purpose of God in bringing Melchisedec into contact with Abraham in the hour of Abraham's military triumph; it is still more obvious in bringing him into contact with Abraham himself, rather than with any of his descendants, and securing for him, in *his* homage, that of all his descendants, including of course Moses.

4. Now consider how great this man was, unto whom (not 'even,' as in the Common Version, but *to whom, in addition to all his other marks of dignity, also*[1]) **the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the** (*choicest*) **spoils.** The author selects for comment that particular feature in the recorded transaction which was pertinent to his object. Abraham paid tithes to Melchisedec, evidently self-moved and in acknowledgment of his priestly character. His respect was shown by the nature of the gift: he gave a tenth not merely of all, but (ἀκροθίνια, *the top of the heap*) of the choicest spoils, and apparently not merely a tenth of the choicest, but a tenth of all, and that consisting of the choicest. Placed emphatically at the close is his designation as 'patriarch' (πατριάρχης), used in the Septuagint to denote the head of a family, but later the head of a race. It is applied, in 4 Mac. 7 : 19, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; Acts 2 : 29, to David; Acts 7 : 8, 9, to the sons of Jacob; here, with special emphasis designating the great Founder of the race. Of course, the greater was Abraham, the greater he to whom Abraham was inferior. The general statement is now illustrated by comparison of the conditions under which Melchisedec and the Levitical priests respectively received tithes. The points of difference are four: The Levitical priests tithe by law; he without law, by voluntary bestowment; they tithe their brethren, whom only *law* could enable them to tithe, he a stranger, to whom he must be, therefore, superior; they tithe the descendants of Abraham, he Abraham himself; they tithe as dying men, he as one of whom it is testified that he *liveth.*

5. And verily, etc.—*they indeed* (or, *while they*) *of the sons of Levi that receive the priest's office:* or (with Delitzsch and Kurtz, taking (ἐκ) of *origin* and not partitively) "while they who receive from the sons of Levi the priesthood." The latter is argued by Kurtz on the ground that in the passage below (ἐξ αὐτῶν, 'deriving his lineage *from them*') the preposition (ἐξ) marks origin, and must therefore here. But

[1] Though the καί, *also*, is of doubtful genuineness.

receive the office of the priesthood, have a commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, though they come out of the loins of Abraham:

6 But he whose descent is not counted from them received tithes of Abraham, and blessed him that had the promises.

7 And without all contradiction the less is blessed of better.

receive the priest's office have commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, though these have come out of the
6 loins of Abraham: but he whose genealogy is not counted from them hath taken tithes of Abraham,
7 and hath blessed him that hath the promises. But without any dispute the less is blessed of the better.

nothing hinders our taking it as partitive in the one case and not in the other. And I see no special difficulty in either rendering. The author is not comparing the priests of the tribe of Levi with the other Levites, but the Levitical *priests* with Melchisedec; and the fact that the tithing was made indirectly by the priests through the Levites need in this brief statement create no difficulty. Virtually and really the priests tithed the people. **Have a commandment,** etc. *Have a command, according to the law, to tithe the people, that is, their brethren.* The people were the brethren, and so the equals of the Levitical priests, and could be tithed by them therefore only by *express ordinance.* Melchisedec was of another race, and his receiving tithes, voluntarily bestowed, must be on the ground of his intrinsic and recognized superiority. The subject is a delicate one to a Jew, and but briefly touched. **Though,** etc. (*although they have issued from the loins of Abraham'*). The 'although' here is somewhat difficult. I think it is intended to intimate that these brethren as having sprung from Abraham might expect to be exempted from the tithing (which marked subordination); and thus in elevating the Levitical tithing as embracing even the descendants of Abraham, more highly to exalt Melchisedec, who, as superior to them, rose proportionably higher. If the law allowed them to tithe the descendants of Abraham, how great must he be who, without legal enactment, tithed Abraham himself! The general thought is, while the priests of Israel tithed only by special enactment those who, as their brethren, descendants in common with them from Abraham, were naturally equal, Meichisedec, a stranger, sustaining no natural affinity to Abraham, tithed him with no law that authorized the one to take and required the other to give, and stands therefore in a relation of intrinsic superiority to the Father of the race, while they but sustain a conventional and merely legal superiority to his descendants.

6. But he whose descent is not counted from them—or, *but he, while not reckoning his descent from them*[1]—a stranger of a different race, without legal enactment—**received tithes of,** etc.; or, *hath tithed Abraham*, the head of the race, father both of tithers and tithed. **And** (*hath*) **blessed him that had** (*hath*) **the promises.** Abraham is before presented as rendering homage to Melchisedec in the very flush of victory. He is now represented as receiving the priestly blessing of Melchisedec, while the bearer in himself of all the splendid potentialities, and the head of that vast system of glorious realities wrapped up in the future of his race. He stands in his noblest character at the fountain head of the world's spiritual history, in order still further to magnify Melchisedec. The blessing is solemn, formal, priestly, and prophetic. It is like the blessing which our Lord pronounced upon his disciples, when at his ascension from Olivet, "he lifted up his hands and blessed them." It fully warrants the deduction of the next verse. The historical present, "hath tithed" (δεδεκάτωκεν), makes proper also the *present* rendering of the participle "him who hath," or to give the emphasis of its position, 'him who possesseth.'[2]

7. And without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better (*by the greater*). The reference is of course to formal and official blessing.[3]

[1] The ὁ δέ may be taken as subject, *but he*, with μὴ γενεαλογούμενος as predicate: or as above, ὁ γενεαλ, as subject: in neither case is ὁ δέ united as ὅδε, *this person.*

[2] The original is finely chiastic: "hath tithed Abraham, and him who hath the promises hath blessed." "Abraham" being taken out of its naturally emphatic position, for the rhythmical balance and augmented strength of the whole.

[3] The neuter (ἔλαττον) expresses the thought in its utmost generality; as perhaps also μείζονος at 6 : 16.

8 And here men that die receive tithes; but there he *receiveth them*, of whom it is witnessed that he liveth.
9 And as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, paid tithes in Abraham.
10 For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him.

8 And here men who die receive tithes; but there one, 9 of whom it is witnessed that he liveth. And, so to say, through Abraham even Levi, who receiveth 10 tithes, hath paid tithes; for he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchizedek met him.

8. And here (*here, indeed*, ὧδε μέν)[1] in the case of the Levitical priesthood, in the case nearest in time and most familier to the writer and his readers: the reference is not here to the order in which the two classes have been spoken of. **Men that die** (*dying men*) **receive tithes.** 'Men that die,' either equivalent to mortal man; or, better, men dying one after another, perpetually dying. The primary emphasis is on 'dying'; but a secondary emphasis is on 'men'; otherwise we should have had simply 'those that die' (οἱ ἀποθνήσκοντες). The author thus throws a slight vail of mystery over Melchisedec; he puts purposely out of view his human personality, to emphasize that feature of his similarity to the Son of God, that he *liveth*. **But there,** in the case of Melchisedec, remoter in time and to the readers' thought.[2] **He** [*received them*] **of whom it is witnessed that he liveth.** How and where testified? Not, of course, by the author, but in the Old Testament narrative; and there, as above remarked, by the deep vail of *silence* thrown over his origin and death, a silence so exceptional to its general manner. Above, this absence of parentage and death marks Melchisedec's fitness for symbolizing the eternity of Christ's priesthood: here its more immediate purpose is to enhance the dignity of Melchisedec himself.

9. And—*as one might say, through Abraham even Levi who receiveth tithes hath paid tithes.* This is commonly (as by Alford) placed co-ordinately with ver. 5–8, as a third (or fourth) proof of the inferiority of the Levitical priesthood to that of Melchisedec. It may, indeed, be taken as another proof of the superiority of Melchisedec to the Levitical priests—the comparison of their *priesthood* comes in later—but it is, perhaps, better to carry it back to ver. 4, and regard it as an advance on the statement there made in illustration of Melchisedec's greatness; all between ver. 5–8, being a parenthetical statement of the different conditions under which Melchisedec and the Levitical priests received tithes; and the author now returning to complete the picture of ver. 4, by representing Levi as paying tithes in Abraham his ancestor. Still nothing is lost, perhaps, by regarding ver. 9, 10, as an after thought; especially as this may be indicated by the 'as one might say,' which implies that the thought is not with the author one of primary importance, and the meaning of which phrase there is no reason to question.

10. For he was yet (*still*) **in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him.** Levi, here put generically for his tribe, was potentially in Abraham. He therefore in Abraham rendered, 'as one might say,' homage to Melchisedec. 'Still (ἔτι) in the loins' stands contrasted with the 'having issued from the loins' in ver. 5. The sentiment here expressed half hesitatingly by the author, involves, doubtless, a great truth. The stream is contained in the fouutain; the branches in the stock; the stock itself in the root and seed. In Adam lay the whole body of his descendants, and in his fall fell his posterity in a far deeper sense than that of any dogmatic imputation. The slender thread of a constructive transgression is a figment compared with that element of uneradicable depravity which entered the race that lay folded up in Adam when the devil met him. This principle has also eminent applicability to Abraham, because he was specially constituted the head of a *peculiar* race. He had the promises, and in him lay enfolded the destinies of the world. Nor would it in this case, I think, as it would in the case of Adam, have made a difference had Isaac already been born. The ancestor of the race stood for his posterity. As to the application of this principle to our Lord, we must remember that his entrance into the Jewish race, as well as his whole personality, was extraordinary and miraculous. Before Abraham he was; and as Alford justly

[1] The balancing of clauses so familiar to classic Greek, μέν and δέ, is more constant with our author than with any other New Testament writer.

[2] ὧδε and ἐκεῖ partly temporal, partly logical.

11 If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need *was there* that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron?
12 For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.
13 For he of whom these things are spoken pertaineth

11 Now if there was perfection through the Levitical priesthood (for under it hath the people received the law), what further need *was there* that another priest should arise after the order of Melchizedek, and not
12 be reckoned after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of neces-
13 sity a change also [1]of the law. For he of whom these things are said [2]belongeth to another tribe,

1 Or, *of law*.....2 Gr. *hath partaken of.* See ch. ii. 14.

says, "was never in the loins of an earthly father." On his mother's side he was the Son of man; on his father's side he was, like Adam, the Son of God. (Luke 3 : 38.)

(*c*) Application of these facts in regard to Melchisedec to the subject. The introduction of a new priesthood implies the failure of the Levitical, and the abrogation of the law for which it stood responsible. (11, 12.)

Thus far the author has dealt with the personal and priestly character of Melchisedec; not a word as yet respecting the priesthood and the law and covenant with which it stands connected. That point is disposed of in the next verse and needs afterward to be but incidentally touched by way of contrast in some of those things in which it is inferior to the Melchisedec priesthood of the Lord. Ver. 11 may be regarded as a common introduction to the entire following passage to ver. 25, though its more special relation is to the first of the four points which it includes.

11. If therefore perfection, etc.—*If indeed completion, accomplishment, was through the Levitical priesthood* (*for upon its basis the people have received the law*), *what further need was there that a different priest should arise, after the order of Melchisedec, and not be reckoned after the order of Aaron?* Here, first, it is evident that the question, 'what further need,' is equivalent to a denial of any further need. The question is an emphatic negative affirmation. Secondly, it is immaterial whether the construction be 'if perfection was, what need was there?' or (with suppressed ἄν in the apodosis, τίς ἂν χρεία), "what need would there be?" Either mode of denial is equally decisive, though in a slightly different way: "If it *was* so, then there was no need;" "if it were, or had been so, there would have been no need." Thirdly, we have the decisive argument for the inadequacy of the Levitical priesthood; namely, the divine act appointing another priest of a different order. When the Ascended Son enters the heavenly sanctuary, and is greeted with the words, "Thou art a priest after the order of Melchisedec," there is an unceremonious setting aside of the priesthood of Aaron, as stamped with the seal of incompetency. There is no occasion to reason further; the 'what need' of the passage is decisive. And, fourthly, along with the Levitical priesthood, goes the Levitical law.

12. For the priesthood being changed, there is made (*takes place*) **of necessity a change also of the law**—the whole ritual system of Judaism; the covenant, of which that priesthood was the minister and guarantee. On the basis of this priesthood, the people had received the law, and this had been made answerable to God for its efficiency. Had it fulfilled this end; had there been through it *accomplishment* (τελείωσις), it would have stood. Being found impotent for this, it must be set aside, and with it the whole system which rested upon it, and for which it was answerable. We see, then, how significant, how revolutionary in the whole system of Judaism, this removal of the priesthood. Finally, the 'if indeed, now' (εἰ μὲν οὖν) of ver. 11 implies that the author had in mind an alternative to his supposition. This, if expressed, would have been, "but if there was not *accomplishment* (τελείωσις), then there was need," etc.; but this *apodosis* of his sentence is suppressed as unnecessary, and ver. 12 proceeds, as we have seen, to state the result of the change of the priesthood in an abrogation of the law. This verse (not a mere parenthetical statement, as De Wette) is now illustrated in the following verses, showing the nature and wide-reaching extent of this change. It is first a *tribal* change, which, removing the priesthood from the tribe of Levi, would of course do away with all peculiarly Levitical arrangements (ver. 13, 14); and next, what is incomparably more important, it is a change in internal character and vital efficacy. (15-19.)

(*d*) This change in the law shown historically in the change of the priestly tribe. (13, 14.)

13. For he of whom these things are

to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar.
14 For *it is* evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood.
15 And it is yet far more evident: for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest,
16 Who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.

from which no man hath given attendance at the
14 altar. For it is evident that our Lord hath sprung out of Judah; as to which tribe Moses spake nothing
15 concerning priests. And *what we say* is yet more abundantly evident, if after the likeness of Mel-
16 chizedek there ariseth another priest, who hath been made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an [1]endless life:

1 Gr. *indissoluble.*

spoken (*said*)—he who is the subject of this extraordinary language, "Thou art a priest," etc.; the author proceeds to illustrate the prophecy by an appeal to historical fact. **Pertaineth** (*belongeth*) **to another tribe from which no man gave** (*hath given*) **attendance at the altar.** Of course, making no account of possible irregularities, and infractions of the law.

14. For it is evident (*open to the day;* πρόδηλον, conspicuously manifest) **that our Lord sprang** (*hath sprung*) **out of Juda.**[1] **Of which,** etc., or, *as to which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priests*—a softened expression to denote the fact that every tribe but that of Levi was rigorously excluded from the priesthood. These historical statements establish, of course, the actual transfer of the priesthood, which of itself would nullify the main features of the ritual law, and break up the outward economy of Judaism. But the change is much more radical; it goes, as the author proceeds to show, to the inner and essential character of the priesthood.

(*e*) The change is shown more clearly in the *intrinsic character* of the new priesthood, which is constituted not after a carnal ritual, but after the power of an endless life. (15–19.)

15. And it is yet far more evident—not with Delitzsch, that the Levitical priesthood is imperfect; this is understood, and is not now in question; nor as Ebrard, absurdly, that our Lord sprang from Judah; the original word here (κατάδηλον) is no correlative of that in ver. 14 (πρόδηλον); the verbal coincidence is merely accidental: but (as substantially Bleek, Lünemann, Alford, though scarcely in the full sense of the author) that there has become a change in the law; that the old Levitical ritual, for which the Levitical priests stood sponsors, has been swept away by the new Melchisedec priesthood of Christ, and a law of totally different character and infinitely higher efficiency has come in its stead. Here, in fact, is the *vital*, the turning point, of the whole matter. **For that,** strictly, *if*, equivalent to *in that* (the 'if' expressing simply condition, not doubt) *after the likeness of Melchisedec ariseth a different priest.* It was a small thing that the priesthood passed from one tribe to another. For weightier is the character of the new priest, indicated by the words 'after the likeness of Melchisedec,' on which word rests the emphasis, the word 'likeness' being now substituted for 'order,' to bring out the resemblance of Christ's priesthood to that of him who, on the sacred page in the Old Testament by an extraordinary reticence, in the New by profound and careful interpretation, is exhibited as *living.* Here, also, as in ver. 11, we have the original word (ἕτερος), meaning qualitatively *different*, rather than that word, signifying numerically *another* (ἄλλος), as marking a change in the kind, as well as the personnel, of the priestly office.

16. Who is (*hath been*) **made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless** (*indissoluble, imperishable*) **life.** The two clauses are carefully balanced against each other, 'law' answering to 'power' and 'carnal commandment' to 'imperishable, indissoluble, indestructible life.' This favors our taking "law" (with Chrysostom) for statute law, the law of Moses, and thus explaining "a law which consists in a fleshly ordinance." Otherwise, it seems more natural to interpret "law," as in Rom. 7 : 21, as *rule, norm, regulative principle*, and standing without emphasis. (So Bleek, Lünemann, Alford, Moll.) The substantial sense of the clause remains unaffected. The contrast lies essentially in this: the Levitical priesthood is

[1] Ἀνατέταλκεν, either *has arisen*, as the sun (ἀνατολαί, the *sunrisings, the east*, Mark 16 : 2), or *has arisen*, sprung up, as a plant. The former might be indicated by Num. 24 : 17; Mal. 4 : 2: Isa. 60; the latter by Isa. 44 : 4; Ezek. 17 : 6. The word has both meanings in the classics.

17 For he testifieth, Thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.
18 For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof.
19 For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope *did;* by the which we draw nigh unto God.

17 for it is witnessed *of him,*
Thou art a priest for ever
After the order of Melchizedek.
18 For there is a disannulling of a foregoing commandment because of its weakness and unprofitableness
19 (for the law made nothing perfect), and a bringing in thereupon of a better hope, through which we

constituted by special, formal, as it were, arbitrary enactment, committed to fleshly, dying men, and bound to all the conditions of human imperfection and mortality (σάρκινος, *fleshen, made of flesh*). Christ's priesthood, on the other hand, modeled after that of one who *lives*, is by virtue of an inherent vital energy in him who bears it, and who, not as a member of a tribe, but in the unity of his own person, bears it *forever*. The 'indestructible life' may (with Alford, Delitzsch) be regarded as commencing strictly after his resurrection, when "death had no more dominion over him"; but the 'power' of that imperishable life was with him from the dawn of his humanity, empowering him to lay down his life and to take it again, and triumphing in his resurrection. In illustrative confirmation of this, the author again cites passingly and parenthetically the oft-quoted passage from the Psalm.

17. For he testifieth (or, *it is testified*), **Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec,** with special emphasis on the 'forever.'

18, 19. These verses state now, in plainest and most decisive terms, the full consequences of this change of priesthood; we have in it the critical and hinging point of the whole chapter. Priesthood and law, impotent and inoperative, are swept away together, and replaced by a better hope, that brings the spiritual alien *near to God.* **For there is** (*becometh*) **a disannulling** (abrogation, ἀθέτησις, stronger than the gentle μετάθεσις, *change*, of ver. 12) *of a foregoing commandment* (the participle, προαγούσης, takes the place of the article)—not merely the law of the priesthood, but the whole Mosaic ritual, that was based upon it—*because of its weakness and unprofitableness* (the adjective, according to Delitzsch, being a milder form than the noun, which would have charged weakness and inefficiency rather on its essential nature than its adjuncts.) **For the law made nothing perfect** (*brought nothing to perfection, accomplishment*). This is thrown in parenthetically, as justifying the abrogation of the old system. 'Law' is now used as covering the whole Mosaic economy, not only the ritual, but the moral law, between which the Jew made no sharp distinction. If we can distinguish them—the moral law *required* perfection, but had no power to produce it; the ceremonial law *symbolized* perfection, but had no power to turn its shadows into substance. The moral law was impotent on account of the carnal natures that received its commands; the ceremonial law was impotent on account of the carnal elements of which it consisted. The apostle, in Rom. 8 : 3, in his "impossible for the law in that it was weak through the flesh," refers to the former of these grounds of impotence, the perverseness of the nature with which it dealt. **But,** etc.; *and a bringing in thereupon* (ἐπί, *thereupon*, and, if the case requires it, *in its place*) *of a better hope.* '*A hope*,' put in the concrete as the substitute for those impotent elements that produced *no hope.* The contrast is not that of a better or mightier hope with a feebler one, but of that better and mightier thing, '*a hope*' (the construction is elliptical) with the utter hopelessness that environed the Old Economy. The Old Economy did indeed, in its significant symbols, in its prophetic foreshadowings, involve a hope for the anointed eye that could discern it. But this is not now in the author's mind, but what these were or were not in themselves. The New Testament believer's salvation is indeed as yet but in *hope*, but it is a real and living one, and one **by which we draw nigh unto God**—the very crown and climax of the whole priestly work of Christ. It was *symbolized* in the Jewish high priest's entering the Holy of Holies. The most significant and remarkable event attending the crucifixion was the rending of the vail of the temple, which was a standing symbol of *separation from God.* Christ's ascent to heaven, after his resurrection, was into the presence of God as *Forerunner* of his people.

(*f*) A further proof of the superiority of

20 And inasmuch as not without an oath *he was made priest:*
21 (For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec:)
22 By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament.
23 And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death:
24 But this *man*, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood.

20 draw nigh unto God. And inasmuch as *it is* not
21 without the taking of an oath (for they indeed have been made priests without an oath; but he with an oath [1] by him that saith [2] of him,
The Lord sware and will not repent himself,
Thou art a priest for ever);
22 by so much also hath Jesus become the surety of a
23 better covenant. And they indeed have been made priests many in number, because that by death they
24 are hindered from continuing: but he, because he abideth for ever, [3] hath his priesthood [4] unchange-

1 Or, *through*.....2 Or, *unto*.....3 Or, *hath a priesthood that doth not pass to another*.....4 Or, *inviolable*.

the Melchisedec priesthood, is that it is instituted with the sanction of an oath. (20–22.)

20. And inasmuch as not without (*the taking of*) **an oath** (ὁρκωμοσία, a word of more fullness and dignity than ὅρκος) [*does this take place*—that is, the appointing of the Melchisedec priest; not, the bringing in of a better hope].

21. For those priests—*For they, indeed, have been made without the swearing of an oath, but he with an oath by him that saith of him*—(periphrastic description of God, as 2: 10). **The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever.**[1]

22. By so much also was Jesus made (*hath Jesus become* **the surety of a better testament** (*covenant*). The solemnity of the oath with which this priesthood was inaugurated is the measure of its superiority or excellence. Of course, on the part of God, nothing can enhance the weight of his promise; the oath is added in accommodation to our human weakness and human usages. In the original, 'Jesus' is emphatically placed last, as if to gather up in that final word the substance of the previous less individualized statements regarding the New Testament priesthood. Here, first in this Epistle, occurs the word *covenant* (διαθήκη—primarily, *disposition, arrangement*).[2] The Old Testament Dispensation is properly a covenant, a mutual agreement between God and the people. The New Testament use of the word is probably an *echo* from the Old, a rhetorical transfer, without special appropriateness, of a word which had become familiar to the Old Economy. The New Covenant is all on one side—God is a gracious Giver, and his people grateful receivers of the inestimable boon. In 9: 16, the word slides over into *testament;* here such a rendering seems without reason. A 'surety' belongs rather to a covenant than to a will. Of this better covenant, Jesus is surety, not as *sealing* it with his death and resurrection (as Alford, Lünemann), for these *created* it, and could scarcely, therefore, be its guarantee; but as High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary, perpetual and unfailing, in emboldening his people to draw near to God, assured that the throne of justice has become a throne of grace. He is surety, not to God on behalf of his people, but to them on behalf of God.

(*g*) Christ's Melchisedec priesthood, unlike the Levitical succession, is a single, perpetual, everlasting priesthood, which can thus carry through to completeness its work of salvation. (23–25.)

23. And they truly, etc.—*And they, indeed, have been made priests many in number;* that is, not many contemporaneously, but in succession, one after another dying and leaving his office to his successor. The Levitical priesthood contained, indeed, a plurality of members; but the *high priest*, the proper prototype of our Lord, was single. **Because they were not suffered,** etc., or, *on account of their being hindered by death from abiding*—that is, in the priesthood; for so the language must be supplemented. Both the compound verb (παραμένειν, *remain with*, or, *abide with* or *beside*), demands this; and to explain it absolutely, of *abiding in life*, converts the sentence into a platitude, 'because they are hindered by death from abiding in life.'

24. But this man (*he*) **became.** etc.—

1 "After the order of Melchisedec," of the received text, is here wanting in Codex Sinaiticus B C 17 80, and probably not genuine.

2 The word διαθήκη is, in the classics, *testamentary disposition, will:* and there rarely equivalent to συνθήκη, covenant, agreement; but so, commonly, in the Septuagint and the New Testament (διά having probably there its frequent force in composition of marking mutual relation, as διαλέγεσθαι, *to converse with*).

25 Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.
26 For such a high priest became us, *who is* holy,

25 able. Wherefore also he is able to save [1] to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.
26 For such a high priest became us, holy, guileless,

1 Gr. *completely.*

on account of his remaining forever. 'Remaining,' not in the priesthood, but abideth in life. The verb (μένειν, by no means equivalent to παραμένειν in ver. 23) naturally indicates this, and the same law of connection which there demands that the verb denote continuing in the priesthood here points to continuing in life. There, there are numerous priests, because they are hindered by death from abiding in their priesthood; here, he, because he abides in life forever, *hath his priesthood unchangeable.* The adjective (ἀπαράβατος) is not without difficulty. If, with some of the Greek commentators (as Theophylact), we could render it *actively, not passing by, not transient,* all would be easy; but this seems scarcely admissible. It is probably better taken passively, and then to be rendered either *not to be passed by,* hence, *not to be superseded;* or better, as of a law or usage (from παραβαίνω), to *go aside from or beyond, to transgress, violate, not to be violated, not to be transgressed;* hence, *inviolable, unalterable.* In either way we come substantially to the same meaning. The consideration is clearly one of great force, and presents the Melchisedec priesthood of the Son in forcible contrast to the imperfections of the Jewish Sacerdotal order. The priests of Israel received their priesthood, exercised it, and died; the continuity of their service was perpetually broken; every link was stamped with frailty and mortality, and the whole order partook of the frailty of its individual numbers. Such a priesthood could accomplish no complete salvation; but mark in contrast the prerogative of *his* priesthood who *liveth.*

25. Wherefore also—from his abiding forever with untransmissible priesthood—**he is able to save to the uttermost** (*completely*)—thoroughly, 'to the uttermost,' though not exactly in the sense suggested by these words in the Common Version. **Them that come** (*draw near*) **unto God by** (*through*) **him.** All worship is essentially a drawing near to God. The priests of the Old Covenant sought to bring the worshipers near to God, but they were snatched away by death even from their partial work of priestly intercession. **Seeing** (*that*) **he ever liveth** (while or because of his always living) **to make** (for the purpose of making) **intercession for them** (*on their behalf*). The ever living is an emphatic iteration of the abiding forever. The phrase 'to make intercession for them' enhances the grace of Christ, as if his eternal life were for the benefit of his people. (Rom. 8:34.) His salvation, then, is a complete salvation. Through his perpetual life and perpetual priesthood, he can carry it through to the uttermost. Perfected himself, he can bring to perfection all his followers, pardoning, sanctifying, justifying, glorifying.

(*h*) Exultant summing up of the qualities of Christ's Melchisedec priesthood, necessary to be allied with those of the Aaronical high priest, to which topic verses 26–28 form a transition.

The Melchisedec priesthood introduces the elements of *royalty* and *perpetuity*, attributes of the ever living King. The Aaronic priesthood must add the element of *expiatory sacrifice* for sin. Without this the Melchisedec priesthood were magnificent, but barren. The word *high priest* introduced at ver. 26 shows all these majestic priestly qualities uniting themselves in that priesthood which, as antitype of Aaron's, makes effectual offering for sin. The priestly successor of Melchisedec appears now as the high priestly counterpart of Aaron. The saving to the uttermost implies guilt and condemnation, from which there can be no saving without expiation. Here, then, slipping in, as it were, the word *high priest* (ἀρχιερεύς), the writer shows how around him cluster the afore-described attributes, before proceeding to the express consideration of the Levitical element. It is conceived, as De Wette well remarks, in a strain of exultant joy over those all-sufficient, glorious attributes of the great High Priest.

26. For such a high priest (*also*) [1] **be-**

1 The 'also' (καί) is wanting in the Sinaitic MS., but appears in A B D E, and is forcible.

harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens;
27 Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself.

undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher
27 than the heavens; who needeth not daily, like those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins and then for the *sins* of the people; for this he

came us, holy, harmless (*guileless*), **undefiled, separate** (*being, having been separated*) **from sinners, and made** (*become*) **higher than the heavens.** The artistic arrangement of the opening words cannot be reproduced in English. The elliptical 'for' involves the suppressed idea that this lay in the nature and demands of the case. 'Such' suggests the priest before described, whose attributes are here little more than gathered up, scarcely added to. 'Became us'—emphatic in position; *befitted us* as sinners. 'Became also'[1]—was (in addition to its being a fact) *also* befitting. And finally, 'high priest' comes out unexpectedly at the end of the clause (though not without amplest previous preparation in the Epistle), and empahtically merging the priest in the high priest (the ἱερεύς in the ἀρχιερεύς), and enabling the author to unite the attributes of both. 'Holy'—pious, perfect in all his relations to God (ὅσιος), positively and actively pious; not legally *sacred*, or simply *sanctified* (ἅγιος). 'Thy holy one' (ὅσιος), Ps. 16 : 10; cited of Christ, Acts 3 : 14. '*Void of evil*' (ἄκακος), *without evil*, denoting his character toward men, as (ὅσιος) *pious*, toward God. It marks freedom from guile, enmity, suspicion. '*Undefiled*' (ἀμίαντος), *unstained*. The Levitical high priest must be ceremonially and outwardly without stain; the true High Priest must be internally and really so, and free, not only from internal defilement, but possible contamination. Hence, *separated from sinners*, not merely from sin; withdrawn from their defiling and disturbing contact into the heavenly sanctuary, where neither their violence, nor their wickedness, can hinder his priestly work. '*Become higher than the heavens*'—here an animated and exulting expression of the transcendent exultation of the New Testament High Priest. The Levitical high priest was ceremonially clean, and withdrawn partially from sinners into the earthly sanctuary. His great Antitype and Successor is absolutely and inwardly pure, completely withdrawn from the disturbing contact of sinners, exalted above the very heavens, through which he has passed (4 : 14; Eph. 4 : 10) into the immediate and absolute presence of God, and thus beyond all finite and creature limitations.

27. This verse converges the attention more on the Levitical side of the Lord's priesthood; namely, his high priesthood. **Who needeth not,** etc.—*hath no necessity day by day, just as the high priests, to offer up sacrifices previously for his own sins, and afterward for those of the people.* The point of contrast is here really, though not in form, twofold. Christ has not need, like the Levitical priests, to offer sacrifices for his own sins at all; for he has none; nor like them to offer sacrifices for the people *day by day*, or repeatedly; for his one offering is forever sufficient. But in the second point we meet a difficulty. The expiatory offerings of the Levitical high priests are manifestly referred to; but these were offered not *daily*, but *yearly*. The solutions are various. Some have taken the original phrase (καθ' ἡμέραν) not as equivalent to *daily*, but 'on an appointed day in the year' (Schlichting, Michaelis); others as equivalent to διαπαντός, indicating annual repetition, perpetually recurring (Grotius, Böhme, De Wette, Ebrard); others as qualifying not the actual ministrations of the priests, but the supposed ministrations of Christ; not that which they *do*, but that which he *would have* to do, provided his sacrifice required repetition at all, since the same principle that would demand its repetition once a year would demand it every day and constantly (so Hofmann and formerly Delitzsch); others (as Kurtz, connecting the καθ' ἡμέραν with ἐχει ἀνάγκην), "hath daily necessity," confine its reference to the need, which the human and imperfect Levitical priest is under, on account of his daily sinning, to make daily offering for himself. Others (as Bleek, Tholuck, Lünemann, Moll) "suppose that the author, with his mind specially on the singleness and finality of *the sacrifice of Christ*, has in loose and inexact expression blended the priestly sacrifices in general with the grand high priestly sacrifice on the annually recurring Day of Atonement." This becomes the more probable, since the high priest was empowered to take part, as often as he chose, in the

[1] **Καί, *also*, is found in A B D E, and is undoubtedly genuine.**

28 For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, *maketh* the Son, who is consecrated for evermore.

28 did once for all, when he offered up himself. For the law appointeth men high priests, having infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was after the law, *appointeth* a Son, perfected for evermore.

daily burnt offering, and not unfrequently exercised this privilege, particularly on Sabbaths, new moons, and festal occasions (Josephus, "Jewish War," V. 5, 6), and also in the daily incense offerings to which was ascribed an atoning significance. (Lev. 17 : 11, 12; Num. 33 : 10, LXX.) But the priest's successive offerings for himself and the people have probably special reference to the great Day of Atonement. Of the above explanations the last seems far the more probable; most of them, I think, may be at once set aside. **For this he did once** (*for all*) **when he offered** (*in offering*) **up himself.** His single sacrifice in pouring out his life on the cross was the substance of all the repeated symbolical sacrifices of the ancient priesthood.[1] It will be observed that the author only glances here and there (as 1 : 3; 5 : 7, and here) at Christ as a *sacrifice* on the cross. This he takes for granted, but loves to contemplate rather his priestly life in heaven. Not Christ the *victim*, but Christ the *priest*, is the subject of discussion.

28. For the law—the Mosaic ordinances—**maketh** (*constituteth*) **men**—emphasis on *men:* Christ, though on earth a man, was even then something more than man; now his humanity is gloriously overdrawn by his divinity, the Son of man almost swallowed up in the Son of God—**high priests which have** (*having*) **infirmity.** Christ on earth, indeed, was encompassed with infirmity; he knew the weakness of humanity that he might sympathize with his brethren. But 'infirmity,' in its fullest sense, he never knew; and now, in his glorified, high-priestly state, the infirmities of his earthly condition, his liability to temptation and suffering and death, are all removed. **But the word of the oath, which was since** (*after*) **the law** (which succeeded to it and set it aside) *constituteth* **the Son**—having been perfected for evermore. Here once more we have the contrast between the priesthood of the law and the priesthood of the oath. The one constitutes men, the other constitutes the Son (the article omitted for the same reason as in 1 : 1 to emphasize not the person but the character). The one appointed men *having* infirmity, actually possessing and wearing it as a garment; the other the Son, now ascended to the right hand of God, freed from all temporary infirmity, and perfected forever, thus taking up into his glorious Melchisedec priesthood all the functions of the Levitical, and qualified to accomplish what that could only symbolize.

Ch. 8. (4) *The efficient Aaronical high priesthood of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary.* (8 : 1-10 : 18.)

The author now passes formally from Christ's Melchisedec to his Aaronic priesthood, to that element of it which adapts it to *sinners*. The discussion extends to 10 : 18, and revolves mainly around *one central idea*, that of Christ offering in the heavenly tabernacle his own efficacious blood as a counterpart to the earthly high priest offering in the earthly tabernacle the blood of goats and heifers, which cannot take away sin. Every other topic, I think, will be found subordinate to this, and will derive its light from this central idea. It divides itself into two parts. From 8 : 1 to 9 : 11 the main thought is that Christ has entered as High Priest into the heavenly sanctuary with his own expiatory blood. From 9 : 11 to 10 : 18 the main thought is that the offering of the blood of Christ, unlike the symbolical and oft-repeated offerings of the earthly priests, is efficacious, final, and forever. Let us analyze from 8 : 1 to 9 : 11.

(*a*) As a royal Melchisedec Priest, Christ has taken his seat at the right hand of God, and as Levitical High Priest he has gone into the heavenly tabernacle. (1, 2.)

(*b*) As such a High Priest, Christ must of necessity have something to offer. (3.)

(*c*) So vitally connected are these two, the priesthood and the offering, that *on earth* there would be no place for his priesthood, as there exist already there those who make the offerings of the law, and whose prerogatives are inviolate. (4.)

(*d*) But, in fact, he *is* a High Priest, and can, therefore, make offerings, because he has

[1] ἀναφέρειν is used of offering up himself on the cross; προσφέρειν, of bringing his blood as an offering into the sanctuary.

CHAPTER VIII.

NOW of the things which we have spoken *this is* the sum: We have such a high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens;

1 [1]Now [2]in the things which we are saying the chief point *is this:* We have such a high priest, who sat down on the right hand of the throne of

1 Or, *Now to sum up what we are saying: We have, etc.*.....2 Gr. *upon.*

the true tabernacle and the true priesthood, of which theirs were but a shadow, and a priesthood as much better than theirs as is the covenant, of which he is the Mediator, better than theirs. (5, 6.)

(*e*) For that it *is* better than the first (this subordinately and in passing) is clear from its having superseded it. For God, having found the first inefficacious, replaces it by a new, and the former one becomes antiquated and expires. (7–13.)

(*f*) But that First Covenant (for to see how the New is organized, we must look back to that, its copy; and to see what the new High Priest must offer, we must look back and see what the old one offered) had its ordinances of service, and its sanctuary consisting of two tabernacles, an outer or more common, and an inner and holier one. (9 : 1–6.)

(*g*) Now in the outer sanctuary the priests performed constant ministrations, but into this inner sanctuary the high priest went alone once a year, *not without blood*—he carried in there the blood of slaughtered victims, symbolically, though not really, expiatory of sin. (6–10.)

(*h*) We see, then, what is demanded of our High Priest. It is *blood.* And as his is the true, and not the symbolical priesthood, as he is in the genuine, and not the copied sanctuary, he must offer blood that is really, and not symbolically, cleansing. He brings *his own.* (11–14.)

Thus the author has advanced, by an almost straight line and with a steady step, to his object. If he has apparently deviated, it was but *apparently.* Verses 7–13 of chapter 8 are merely an incidental (incidental to the present *argument,* though vital as a part of the entire discussion) carrying out of the reason why Christ *can be* a High Priest; namely, that he has the true priesthood of the New Covenant by which the former has been superseded on account of its inadequacy. So 9 : 1-10 is a provisional examination of such features of that Old Covenant as bear directly on the high priest's function, in order to deduce then e the functions of the High Priest of the New Covenant in the true tabernacle, and especially to ascertain what it is that he must offer. Then 9 : 11–14, 15–28, declaring the cleansing efficacy of his blood, closes the second topic propounded in the author's brief triple thesis (6 : 20), 'After the order of Melchisedec,' 'high priest,' 'forever.' The third, embraced in the emphatic term '*forever,*' though certainly all along implied in every feature of Christ's work, may perhaps (with Delitzsch) be regarded as forming the special keynote to 10 : 1–18, where the formal discussion closes.

(*a*) As a royal Melchisedec Priest, Christ has taken his seat at the right hand of God, and as Levitical High Priest, he has gone into the heavenly tabernacle. (1–3.)

1. Now of the things, etc.—*And as a capital point in regard to what we are saying* (literally, *in regard to what is being said;* equivalent to, the topic under discussion). 'Chief, leading, capital point' (κεφάλαιον) is here far better than the other meaning, 'sum,' or 'summing up,' as in the Common Version. This latter meaning, indeed, would not be wholly inappropriate, inasmuch as verses 1, 2 look both backward and forward, and may be regarded as exhibiting substantially the whole doctrine of Christ's priesthood—ver. 1 in its Melchisedec, ver. 2 in its Levitical aspect. This, however, is equally embraced in the rendering, 'chief or capital point,' which is apparently what the author would express. **We have such a high priest**—that is, 'such' as I am about to describe; 'such' (τοιοῦτος) here looking forward, as at 7 : 26 it looks back—**who is set** (*took his seat*) **on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens.** Identical in meaning with 1 : 3, but intentionally more full and formal in expression. There it is stated incidentally as a fact; here it is laid down formally as a signifi-

[1] A summary of 'the things which we *have* said,' would require ἐπὶ τοῖς εἰρημένοις, not τοῖς λεγομένοις. Still less, can it be rendered, as by some, 'In addition to what has been said' (πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις).

2 A minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.
3 For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore *it is* of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer.

2 the Majesty in the heavens, a minister of [1]the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord
3 pitched, not man. For every high priest is appointed to offer both gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is necessary that this *high priest* also have some-

1 Or, *holy things.*

cant and vital fact connected with the priesthood of our Lord. It is the more literal statement of that which is put more figuratively, and with reference to Christ's anti-Levitical priesthood, in the following verse.

2. A minister—(λειτουργός), *public servant*, or, *functionary*; in the classics, the bearer of a public office; in the Septuagint, sometimes, "one rendering *priestly* service," 'a priest to render offerings,' Neh. 10:39, so Rom. 15:16; and here the term is so applied to Christ—**of the sanctuary and of the true** (*genuine*) **tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not** (*a*) **man.** 'The sanctuary' here clearly denotes the 'holy of holies,' 'the part within the vail,' in which, in the earthly tabernacle, was the special symbol of God's presence, and which, therefore, in the archetypal, the heavenly tabernacle, denotes that immediate presence itself. As King, Christ sits at the right hand of the throne of God; as Priest, he ministers in the heavenly holy of holies, in the perpetual presence of God. Both expressions are mere figures drawn from earthly objects. His sharing God's throne denotes, symbolically, his sharing God's sovereign power; his being in the heavenly sanctuary denotes his being in the immediate and absolute, not the symbolical, presence of God. He ministers there, not as occasionally entering, but perpetually abiding. '*The genuine tabernacle*,' the real, original, archetypal tabernacle (not ἀληθής, *true*, not *false*; but ἀληθινός, *made of truth*, real, genuine, not counterfeit, and not a copy). God is the '*true* God' (ἀληθινός), in contrast with spurious gods, idols; God is *true* (ἀληθής) as a Being who will not utter falsehood. The upper sanctuary was the archetypal sanctuary, of which the earthly one was but a copy, as Christ was the true Priest whom the earthly priest but typified. The words 'true, genuine tabernacle' are here exegetical of 'sanctuary.' The Mosaic tabernacle was divided into two parts—the outer tabernacle, and the inner sanctuary; but the whole went under the general name of tabernacle; and as it would be contrary to all propriety to represent our Lord as ministering in the outer tabernacle, the word can be taken here only in its general sense, and all speculations as to what in the heavenly tabernacle corresponded to the first, or outer one of the earthly, are here, at least, entirely out of place. Only an artificial exegesis can find here any allusion to that first tabernacle, and, therefore, to any of the numerous objects which it has been distorted into symbolizing. Christ appears ministering in the true tabernacle, not the copy; in the heavenly sanctuary, not the earthly; dwelling perpetually in the real presence of God, instead of entering at distant intervals into his symbolical presence. The tabernacle which a man pitched is the material, visible tabernacle of Moses. That which the Lord pitched is the invisible, heavenly tabernacle. Like all the elements of the New Dispensation (see 12:18–27), it is purely spiritual.

(*b*) As such a High Priest, Christ must of necessity have something to offer. (3.)

3. For every high priest is ordained (*appointed*) **to offer** [*both*] **gifts and sacrifices:** *wherefore it is of necessity that also this* (*high priest*, or, *this one*) **have somewhat also to offer** (literally, *something which he may offer*). The 'For' is proleptic: the thought outruns the expression. The writer's mind is filled with the idea that Christ is in the heavenly sanctuary *to make a high priestly offering*. The 'for' responds to and generalizes this latent thought, 'For *every* high priest is constituted to offer gifts,' etc.; and then, having generalized the idea from the special case in question, the writer naturally turns round and deduces the special case from the general fact. In more strictly logical form, it would run, "And, as every high priest is constituted to offer gifts and sacrifices, therefore it is necessary," etc. But the thought is clear, and is but a repetition of the statement of 5:1, which gives the essential function of the high priest, and to which Stuart regards it as now returning. It is in some sense a return to it, but in the writer's direct course of argument. He has unfolded the Melchisedec elements of

4 For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law:
5 Who serve unto the example and shadow of

4 what to offer. Now if he were on earth, he would not be a priest at all, seeing there are those who offer the
5 gifts according to the law; who serve *that which is*

Christ's Sacerdotal office, he proceeds now to develop its Levitical element. But a more important matter is the logical connection of the verse with the context. None of the interpreters, as it seems to me, have fully apprehended it. De Wette unhesitatingly charges it with breaking in upon and disturbing the course of the thought. Lünemann regards it as an incidental remark to justify the term Λειτουργός. Bengel, with others, would enclose it in a parenthesis. Tholuck regards it as introduced but to be crowded out by other ideas. Even Delitzsch fails to make the connection clear. If our analysis, previously given, is correct, it is precisely in its place. It is no disturbing, no incidental idea, nothing to be shut up in parentheses, but is really, precisely the *capital thought* of the writer, that to which the statement of the previous verse was but subsidiary, and that of which all clear on to 9 : 14, and, in fact, to 10 : 18, is only illustrative. Why is Christ minister in the heavenly sanctuary? It is that he may have *something to offer*. What makes the utility of his ministry there? It is that he *has* something to offer. *What it is* the author proceeds by gradually prepared steps to unfold. He is there to offer *his own expiatory blood*, in the conception of the Epistle, the whole pith of his priesthood, and of his work of salvation. Of course, this takes for granted the previous sacrifice as its necessary condition. We are not, then (with De Wette), to render 'It *was* necessary,' instead of the logical copula, 'It *is* necessary'; nor (with Lünemann) to render, "should have offered," making it refer to Christ's earthly sacrifice, instead of his heavenly priesthood. This is a complete perversion of the author's idea. The high priest *in the sanctuary*, and there under the necessary conditions of bringing an expiatory offering, is here his theme.

(*c*) So vitally connected are these two, the priesthood and the offering, that *on earth* there would be no place for his priesthood, as there exist already there those who make the offerings of the law, and whose prerogatives are inviolate. (4.)

4. For if (*indeed*)—so imperative is this necessity of his having, as High Priest, something to offer—**he were on earth, he should** (*would*) **not** [*even*] **be a priest.** There is no stress to be laid on the use of 'priest' for 'high priest' (as if the meaning were, 'so far from being a High Priest, he would not even be a priest'). The use of 'priest' here is purely incidental, the generic idea being put for the specific; the emphasis is on '*would not even be.*' The mention of the vital necessity that he, as high priest, bring offerings, suggests the inquiry, how he can be a priest at all, which of course finds its explanation in the fact that he is not on earth in the copied, but in heaven in the archetypal, tabernacle. The 'for,' then, looks back to the preceding clause, 'necessary that he have something to offer'; the particle (μέν) looks forward (as always), and finds its correlative at ver. 6, *but in fact*[1] (νυνὶ δέ), **Seeing that there are** (since there exist) **those who offer gifts according to the law.** *Being* (ὄντων = *since there are*), emphatic in position. The 'gifts' here are equivalent to 'gifts and sacrifices' of the verse preceding, which stand for the whole body of offerings required by the law. The Levitical order would not be superseded without a reason, and no reason could exist until he came who should fulfill all that it prefigured.

(*d*) But, in fact, he *is* a High Priest, and can, therefore, make offerings, because he has the true tabernacle and the true priesthood, of which theirs were but a shadow, and a priesthood as much better than theirs as is the covenant, of which he is the Mediator, better than theirs. (5, 6.)

5. Who, etc.—the Levitical priests—not only designates but characterizes them, *such persons as* (οἵτινες) *minister to a copy and shadow*

[1] The clause εἰ μὲν γάρ—οὐδ' ἂν ἦν, *for if to be sure—neither would he be*, implies that there *is* a supposition under which his thesis would not hold, which would even exclude the consideration of it. This supposition must first be disposed of. That is the supposition of his being on earth. *There* there is full provision made for offering the gifts of the law; there is a priesthood ordained, whose functions must not be encroached upon. The very form of construction, however, implies that the case thus supposed does *not* exist. Christ is *not* on earth, and therefore he *can* be a priest, and offer sacrifices without violating established institutions.

heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, *that* thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount.

a copy and shadow of the heavenly things, even as Moses is warned *of God* when he is about to [1]make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern that was shewed thee

1 Or, *complete.*

of the heavenly [*sanctuary*] (ἁγίων understood with ἐπουρανίων). They are such as minister to a tabernacle which is a mere representative copy (ὑποδείγμα)[1] of the true. Their ministry is merely prefigurative, and ready to yield when the thing signified comes in place of the sign. The author accomplishes a double purpose. He shows why Christ could not be a priest on earth, and why he can be one in heaven. The earthly ranks are filled up. The earthly sphere of service is pre-occupied; but that sphere is itself merely shadowy and transitory, and there is yet room for him who realizes the significance of that priesthood, and for him alone. **As Moses was admonished,** etc.—that is, *hath been instructed of God when about to complete the tabernacle.* This is added in illustration of the character which he has just assigned to the earthly tabernacle, as being but a copy and adumbration or shadowy image of the heavenly. (Ex. 25 : 40.) **For, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to** (*after*) **the pattern shewed to thee in the mount.** The Mosaic tabernacle was made after a model. How this pattern was shown to Moses it is idle curiously to inquire; nor would there have arisen any question about it but for the rhetorical use to which the author puts it, making it very naturally, as it came from God on Mount Sinai, stand, not for the literal pattern of the tabernacle to be made, but as representative of the divine ideas which that tabernacle was to symbolize. There can really be no doubt that there was shown to Moses in vision, or with the bodily eye, an exact model of the structure which he was to rear, and which model he was precisely to imitate. This is all that seems to be meant by the passage in Exodus, and all which I suppose our author believed it to mean. He has indeed made a figurative application of the language, *as if* the tabernacle which Moses saw in the Mount was the real, original heavenly tabernacle, in which the Lord now ministers. I cannot, however, suppose either that any such thing was implied in Exodus, or that he considered it to be, or supposed himself to be doing anything more than merely accommodating a passage to which he never would have dreamed of giving the force of an argument. God made that tabernacle on Mount Sinai of which the tabernacle of Moses was an earthly and material copy. How natural, in the way of rhetorical illustration, to transfer in idea this divine original to the spiritual tabernacle, in which our Lord ministers, and which both the one and the other merely typified! How natural, I say, without supposing for a moment that the writer was doing more than merely employing an illustration, and addressing an argument to the imagination rather than to the reason! How natural to express the subordinate and copied character of the Levitical tabernacle by a reference to the direction, 'See thou make all after the pattern shewed thee in the mount'! And nothing more strikingly illustrates the routine character of much of our exegesis than the numerous endeavors of interpreters, taking this as a literal and prosaic proof, to find how this heavenly, archetypal tabernacle was revealed to Moses, and what heavenly elements corresponded to the several parts of the earthly structure. The figurative language of the author is appropriate and beautiful, so long as we hold to the figure, and do not undertake to convert rhetoric into logic. When we come to the actual facts of the case we cannot for a moment suppose that there is or was any actual outer and inner sanctuary in heaven, corresponding to the separate compartments of the tabernacle. This was expressive, not of topographical, but of moral and spiritual facts and relations. It was a figure for the time then existing. The vail hanging between the outer and inner

[1] Ὑπόδειγμα is somewhat difficult to define exactly. Ὑποδείκνυμι, to place under the eyes, or to show *in subordination* to something, as its *pattern*, for example, or *copy*; or *to show faintly.* The preposition may give either of these modifications. Hence, ὑπόδειγμα, *something placed under the eyes, a sign, token*; or something shown subserviently to another, its *pattern* or its *copy*; or something shown *faintly* (ὑπό), as an *outline, sketch, faint representation.* Either *copy* or *faint representation*, would answer here.

6 But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises.

6 in the mount. But now hath he obtained a ministry the more excellent, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which hath been enacted

sanctuary, and excluding all but the high priest, and him at all but widely separated times, from the inner, indicated, as the author himself assures us, that the way into the Holiest of All had not yet been opened to man. It indicated simply that for man as a sinner, without atonement and pardon, there was no true access to God. It embodied an idea. It represented a state of things existing on earth, not in heaven, and a state of things which was done away in the death of Christ. The thoroughly symbolical character of the whole is shown by the description of the vail, which was, says the writer, the flesh of Christ. The meaning of this is evident. The death of Christ was necessary in order to break down the wall which separates man from God. At his crucifixion the vail of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, and the separating barrier which his offering in the flesh was necessary to remove might be easily said to consist in his flesh; for the as yet unbroken body of Christ, like the as yet unrent vail of the tabernacle and temple, was between man and God. The inner tabernacle, then, as well as the outer one, can have no other than a moral significance. And with the dying and rising of Christ, the grand idea expressed by the outer one belongs to the past. All efforts to find it in Christ's human body, in his life on earth (Ebrard), in the lower heavens (De Wette, Lünemann, etc.), in Christ's glorified body (Hofmann), in the heaven of glorified saints (Delitzsch), in Christ's mystical body (an attempted union of the two last ideas by Alford), are a waste of ingenuity. That Christ's earthly body, or his life on earth, is the outer tabernacle, needs to be refuted by no argument. That his glorified body is the outer tabernacle is worse than idle fancy; it is simply monstrous. For it is precisely in his glorified body that he dwells in the inner sanctuary, and his glorified body never existed until after the outer sanctuary had been annihilated by his vail-rending death. To convert the *lower heavens* into the outer tabernacle is to transform an important spiritual symbol into a lesson in topography. The explanation which might make nearest approach to plausibility is that of Delitzsch, which makes the outer tabernacle represent the heaven of the saints (including, perhaps, the people of God on earth), who, like the Levitical priesthood, were kept from the more immediate presence of God, and served him at an awful distance, until Christ broke down the separating barrier, and brings them into actual nearness to God. Just so soon, however, as we localize this idea, and make the outer tabernacle a part of the heavenly arrangements, we confuse and destroy the figure. The priest passed through the outer into the inner tabernacle; but Christ could not pass through the outer into the inner tabernacle on high, for that outer tabernacle had ceased to exist. It, or the great fact which it symbolized, was done away at his death. The separating vail, with its solemn and dread significance, had hung from the time of Moses to the scene of Calvary, and then it was rent in twain; and if the Jews replaced it, they performed an act of gratuitous wickedness.

6. But now—(*νυνὶ δέ*), as the case actually stands; (*νυνί*, logical), instead of being on the earth, and ministering to a copy and shadow of the true tabernacle, or being where he *could* only so minister—**hath he obtained a more excellent ministry**—higher priestly service—**by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant which was established** (*hath been instituted*) **upon better promises.** The problem, then, suggested above how Christ *could be* a priest and have something to offer without violating established institutions, is resolved. He could be so, because he comes in with a New Covenant, which supersedes the Old, and he is Priest in the heavenly archetypal sanctuary, which has replaced its earthly semblance. And now to find what he has to offer, what is the nature of his service, we must look back to that covenant which his has superseded, and see what were the typical offerings of its typical priesthood. This would naturally be the author's next topic. He would proceed to deduce from the nature of the offering of the Jewish high priest the nature of the offering brought by Christ. But this is postponed to the next chapter. The mention of Christ's better priesthood, with its better covenant and better promises, leads the

7 For if that first *covenant* had been faultless, then
should no place have been sought for the second.
8 For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the
days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new
covenant with the house of Israel and with the house
of Judah:

7 upon better promises. For if that first *covenant* had
been faultless, then would no place have been sought
8 for a second. For [1] finding fault with them, he saith,
Behold, the days come, saith the Lord,
That I will [2]make a new covenant with the
house of Israel and with the house of
Judah;

1 Some ancient authorities read *finding fault* with it *he saith unto them*.....2 Gr. *accomplish*.

author to pause a moment in the immediate train of argument to show *why* that Old Covenant has been superseded, and wherein consist the better promises of the New.

(*e*) For that the New *is* better than the first (this subordinately and in passing) is clear from its having superseded it. For God, having found the first inefficacious, replaces it by a new, and the former one becomes antiquated and expires. (7–13.)

These verses which illustrate this point might have been omitted without injury to the immediate argument; but they are vital to the general subject, and though strictly a digression, are by no means an unwarranted digression.

7. For if that first covenant, etc.—*that first one were faultless, there would not be sought a place for a second.* Here, as at 7 : 11, the author reasons to the imperfection of the first from the fact of its supersedure. Bleek somewhat fancifully finds this 'place' for the Second Covenant in the 'heart' as distinguished from the tablets of stone on which the older was engraved. But there is no necessity for such refining. The simple and obvious import of the language is that, apart from the imperfection of the First, there would have been no demand for the Second; no room would have been sought for it by the abrogation of the First. The one cannot come without displacing the other.

8-12. An extended citation of a celebrated passage from Jer. 31 : 31–34, which, connected immediately in its origin with the return from the Babylonian captivity, yet has unquestioned ultimate reference to the times of the Messiah. Like most of the Messianic prophecies, it stands originally connected with a subordinate local event, and, like them, passes beyond that event to the great theme and scope of all prophecy, the Messianic epoch and salvation. Although the passage is here subordinate to the author's immediate purpose (Christ's heavenly priesthood in connection with the better Covenant) it is too weighty in its testimony to the superiority of the New Covenant to the Old, to allow of its being passed over. The quotation is from the Septuagint, with slight verbal variations.

8. For—*finding fault* [with it] *he saith to them.* Or, "*For finding fault with them, he saith.*" Either construction has authority, and perhaps nearly equally balanced. If we read the accusative (αὐτούς),[1] the second construction, 'finding fault with them, he saith' is the only possible one. If the dative (αὐτοῖς),[2] we may render still 'finding fault with them' (constructing μέμφομαι with the dative), or more easily 'finding fault [with it] he saith to them.' This latter has slightly against it the position of the dative (αὐτοῖς), which unless emphatic would naturally follow the 'he saith' (λέγει). But, on the other hand, the correspondence between the words 'faultless' and 'finding fault with' (ἄμεμπτος and μεμφόμενος), already makes it natural to apply the 'finding fault' rather to the covenant than to the persons, and creates a strong presumption in favor of the former construction. Besides, as Stuart justly observes (after Theophylact, Grotius, etc.), the passage, in its Old Testament connection, is the one in which God is talking tenderly and graciously, rather than reproachfully, to his people, and throwing the blame of their conduct rather on the inadequacy of the covenant than on their perverseness. With some hesitation, therefore (against Delitzsch and others), I prefer the former construction. We may, indeed, render 'finding fault, he saith to them,' and leave it undecided whether the object of the censure is people or covenant. **Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make** (*accomplish*—literally, '*there come days and I will accomplish*,' by a familiar Hebraism) **a new covenant with** (*upon*) **the house of Israel and the**

[1] With ℵ * A D * K P, etc., followed by Lachmann, Tischendorf (Ed. 8), Westcott and Hort.
[2] With ℵ^{c} D* * * E L, etc., Chrysostom.

9 Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord.
10 For this *is* the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people:

9 Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers
In the day that I took them by the hand to lead them forth out of the land of Egypt;
For they continued not in my covenant,
And I regarded them not, saith the Lord.
10 For this is the covenant that [1] I will make with the house of Israel
After those days, saith the Lord;
I will put my laws into their mind,
And on their heart also will I write them:
And I will be to them a God,
And they shall be to me a people:

1 Gr. *I will covenant.*

house of Judah. The author has substituted for the Septuagint, 'I will institute with the house' (διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ), another expression, 'I will accomplish upon the house' (συντελέσω ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον). He has, however, merely substituted a different rendering, given elsewhere by the Septuagint for the same original expression. He has probably made the variation designedly (De Wette) in order to bring out the idea of *accomplishment* in connection with the New Covenant.

9. Negative characteristic of the New Covenant. **Not according to the covenant that I made** (ἐποίησα; Septuagint, διεθέμην) **with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand** (ἐπιλαβέσθαι, took hold of for the purpose of succoring and rescuing; see similar idea 2 : 16) **to lead them** (*forth*) **out of the land of Egypt.** This indicates clearly the Mosaic Covenant formed in the wilderness. The reference to the circumstances of its formation—when God rescued them from their Egyptian bondage—was designed, by reminding the people how much grace attended the formation of that covenant, to enhance their conception of the grace included in a covenant which shall set that aside as inadequate to answer God's gracious purposes. *That* was a covenant made in the day when he lifted them from their Egyptian bondage. How gracious, then, shall be the Dispensation which shall annul and supersede that as inoperative and worthless! **Because they continued not** (*did not abide*) **in my covenant, and I regarded them not** (*disregarded them*), **saith the Lord.** The emphasis of the original, with its emphatic pronouns, does not quite re-appear in the version: '*They* did not abide,' etc., and *I* in turn neglected *them.* This is added as showing the inadequacy of the covenant. It could not hold either of the parties, though—in each case, respectively—for different reasons. It could not enforce its obligations on the people, and, as it were, compelled God to withdraw his favor from a covenant-breaking people. Nay, with inexpressible tenderness, as if the heart of God were melting within him, he, as it were, takes part of the blame to himself, and finds fault with a covenant which left it possible for the people to disobey him, and, on the other hand, for him to neglect and disregard the people.

10. For (*because*) **this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord.** 'This' is here equivalent to *such, of such a nature;* namely, As I am about to describe. 'Because,' then, is here used in its strictly appropriate sense. God is going to justify his use of the term 'new' in its application to the covenant which he will hereafter form with the people of Israel, and to show why it really *is* a New Covenant. The remainder of the verse may be thus given: *Giving my laws into their understanding* [*will I make it*], *and upon their hearts will I inscribe them.* The above is, perhaps, the simplest mode of completing the participial construction, although it *may* be constructed as follows: 'Giving my laws,' etc., '*also* upon their hearts will I inscribe them.' This, however, makes a difference in the emphasis of the two clauses which seems foreign to the purpose of the author. The construction may be a simple *anacolouthon.* Here is one of the 'better promises' of the New Covenant—the promise of an inward spiritual influence, which shall secure obedience, and make the Covenant effective. A consequence of this immediately follows: **And I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people.** (Exod. 6 : 7, 2 Cor. 6 : 16.) Here is promised the establishing of intimate and confidential relations between God and his people, which cannot be broken up, being

11 And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest.
12 For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.
13 In that he saith, A new *covenant*, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old *is* ready to vanish away.

11 And they shall not teach every man his fellow-citizen,
And every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord:
For all shall know me,
From the least to the greatest of them.
12 For I will be merciful to their iniquities,
And their sins will I remember no more.
13 In that he saith, A new *covenant*, he hath made the first old. But that which is becoming old and waxeth aged is nigh unto vanishing away.

guaranteed by the living spiritual power attendant on the Covenant. The Old Covenant established this relation between God and his people *outwardly*. But it could not make it inward, and, therefore, could not make it permanent.

11. And they shall not teach every man his neighbour (*fellow citizen*), **and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for** (*because*) **all shall** (*will*) **know me, from the least to the greatest** *of them* (literally, *from the small unto the great one of them*). This is the *second* of the better promises of the New Covenant. Its import is that they shall not need to teach one another, because "they shall all be taught of God." God will write his law upon the heart, and instill it into the mind, and thus not leave them to the doubtful and unsatisfactory processes of human instruction. The Divine Spirit will impart to all his direct illuminations. This of course marks the intrinsic and essential character of the New Covenant, as promising and securing to its subjects large and immediate spiritual influence—its ideal character and tendency, which will be realized just in proportion as it accomplishes its work, and fully so when the "people shall be all righteous."

12. The *third* better promise of the New Covenant. *Because* (not γάρ *for*, giving the logical reason of the preceding statement: but ὅτι *because*, assigning the efficient cause of the preceding *fact:* as if he said, "And this shall be, *because*," etc.). **I will be merciful,** etc.—that is, *propitious, gracious toward their acts of unrighteousness, and their sins will I remember no more.* This completes the catalogue of the blessed prerogatives of the New Covenant; those better promises which give it its superiority over the Old. The inward constraining power of God's love; a universal opening of the heart to those teachings of God which will supersede the laborious teachings of men, and make divine knowledge universal; and finally a full and free remission of sins,—are the elements which make up the better promises of the better Covenant.

13. The logical inference from the designation New Covenant. **In that he saith** (*in saying a new* [*covenant*]), **he hath made the first old** (*antiquated*)—he has put it into the category of antiquated things. The logical connection is put for the efficient connection. God's using the term *new* is equivalent to *making* that old which the new displaces. **Now,** etc.; *and that which is becoming antiquated and growing old is near to disappearing*, is on the verge of extinction, is ready to vanish away. This verse puts the seal on the language which declares the imperfection of the First Covenant, and its abrogation to give place to a better, and to a better mediating priesthood. The author has disposed of the question how and under what conditions this new and glorious Melchisedec Priest could be inaugurated and perform his priestly functions. He could not be so on earth, because there is already a regularly constituted priesthood to offer the gifts and sacrifices of the law. He could be so only by taking the heavenly and antitypical instead of the merely typical priesthood, and with this the heavenly throne, instead of the earthly and shadowy sanctuary. And this he could do, because he comes in with a better Covenant which supersedes the Old, by prerogatives admirably illustrated in the citation from Jeremiah. The Old Covenant, then, has passed away, and with it the old priesthood, and the way is now prepared for returning to the thesis of ver. 3; namely, that the High Priest of the New Covenant in the heavenly sanctuary *must have something to offer.* Of this he has not in his temporary digression lost sight, and he now returns to it by inquiring into the arrangements of that priestly service under the Old Covenant, which, though imperfect and transitory, was yet typical of the higher service, and will indicate its nature. He sets forth first some general features of that antiquated Covenant with a

CHAPTER IX.

THEN verily the first *covenant* had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary.
2 For there was a tabernacle made; the first, wherein *was* the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread; which is called the sanctuary.

1 Now even the first *covenant* had ordinances of divine service, and its sanctuary, *a sanctuary* of this
2 world. For there was a tabernacle prepared, the first, wherein [1] *were* the candlestick, and the table, and [2] the shew-bread; which is called the Holy place.

1 Or, *are*.....2 Gr. *the setting forth of the loaves.*

view to showing its dignity and glory, and thus embracing the excellency of the Covenant which has superseded it. All, however, is preliminary and subordinate to the grand point brought out at 9 : 7; namely, that the high priest entered at stated seasons the inner sanctuary *not without blood*, whence also comes out (ver. 11, 12) what is the nature of the high priest's offering on high.

Ch. 9: (*f*) But that First Covenant (for to see how the New is organized, we must look back to that, its copy; and to see what the new High Priest must offer, we must look back and see what the old one offered) had its ordinances of service, and its sanctuary consisting of two tabernacles, an outer or more common, and an inner and holier one. (9 : 1–5.)

1-5. Preliminary description of the tabernacle.

1. Then verily (*now even*) **the first [covenant] had.** We might, perhaps, bring out better the emphasis of the original by rendering a little freely, "There belonged, indeed now, also to the first [covenant]." The logical particle (οὖν) connects with the preceding, and implies that to the First Covenant, though now antiquated and abrogated, we are still to look for instruction regarding the nature of the Second. Though but a copy, it resembled the original: though but a shadow, it represented the substance. The relation of the particle (μέν, which, as always, looks forward, εἶχε μέν, *possessed, indeed*) is a little difficult. It is not quite easy to decide whether it has its correlation in the particle in ver. 6 (δέ, properly "but" or "and," not "now") or of ver. 11. The general thought seems to demand the latter, and when the author commenced the chapter the contrast in his mind was apparently not between the more worldly and non-essential, and the more spiritual, elements in this Covenant, but between its arrangements and those of the New. But as he advances, this contrast between the more and less material features of the old tabernacle come more distinctly into view, making a sort of double antithesis, partly between the structure and the priestly services of the old tabernacle, and partly and still more between these latter and those of the New. Thus, with Delitzsch, I incline to regard the former particle (μέν) as having a double correlation both with ver. 6 and 11, rather than with either separately. That originally in the author's mind, however, I think was with ver. 11. *Had* (εἶχεν) not in contrast to the present actual non-existence of the Old Covenant tabernacle and services (because although the ancient tabernacle did not exist, the temple worship which succeeded to it, did), but to the fact that the Old Covenant itself has become really antiquated and superseded, and has but a tolerated, not a legitimate existence. **Ordinances of divine** (*priestly*) **service** *and its sanctuary of* (*belonging to*) *this world.* The Common Version, 'a worldly sanctuary,' gives the general idea of the latter clause, but not the more precise shade of the original, in which 'worldly' appears either as an after-thought, 'and had its sanctuary, namely, or although, a worldly one;' or simply as predicate; 'and had its sanctuary belonging to the world; namely, the sanctuary which it had belonged to the world.' It contrasts the sanctuary of the Old Covenant, the material Mosaic tabernacle, with its heavenly counterpart in which Christ ministers. The sanctuary is described immediately after, and the ordinances of priestly service in a very general way, so far as is necessary for the writer's purpose, in verses 6, 7.

2. For there was a tabernacle made (*prepared*)—constructed, fitted out, arranged. 'Tabernacle' is here used to denote the whole structure embracing two subordinate tabernacles. The name, when used absolutely however, denotes the whole, without regard to its divisions. **The first**—'the first,' *locally*, to one entering, in distinc-

3 And after the second vail, the tabernacle which is called the holiest of all;
4 Which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein *was* the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant;

3 And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is
4 called the Holy of holies; having a golden [1] altar of incense, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein [2] *was* a golden pot holding the manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the

1 Or, *censer*.....2 Or, *is*.

tion from the Holy of Holies. They were strictly two parts of the tabernacle—**wherein was** (*alike*, τε) **the candlestick** (*the candelabrum*, bearing with its six arms, including the shaft, seven candelabra, Exod. 25 : 31–39; 37 : 17–24)—**and the table** (of acacia wood, overlaid with pure gold, Exod. 25 : 23–30) **and the shewbread** (*setting forth of the loaves*)—doubtless not the mere usage of exhibiting the bread, but the bread actually exhibited, as the author is speaking of concrete objects. (Alford, Delitzsch.) **Which** [*first tabernacle*] **is called the sanctuary**—that is, Holy [things.][1]

3. And after (*behind*) **the second vail** (one vail hung in front of the door of the tabernacle, Exod. 26 : 36, 37), **the tabernacle which is called the holiest of all,** *the Holy of Holies* —a Hebraistic periphrasis for a superlative, equivalent to *the all holy*, the holiest. Our author, however, generally for brevity designates this inner sanctury simply as 'the holy,' 'the sanctuary' (ἁγια).

4. Which had, etc. (*having a golden altar of incense*), or, golden censer—for both these meanings are given to the word (θυμιατήριον), and it is difficult to decide between them.[2] There is no golden censer mentioned in the Law, only a shallow, brazen basin (called in the Septuagint πυρεῖον, not θυμιατήριον), employed by the high priest on the day of atonement, for taking incense from the altar. Later, however, we learn from the Mischna that a golden censer was employed on this day, and much importance is attached to it. Still it could hardly have been kept in the Holy of Holies, (as certainly the πυρεῖον was not), and, therefore, it could be but in a loose sense said to belong to it. But on the other hand, neither was the altar of incense in the Holy of Holies, but was one of the prominent objects of the first tabernacle, and this, therefore, it at first would hardly seem could be intended, unless we attribute (with many) to the author an ignorance of the arrangements of the sanctuary wholly incredible under the circumstances. Neither, then, of the two could the inner sanctuary be said to 'have,' in the sense of actually *containing* it. But either of them it might be said to have, in that both sustained an important relation to it. The censer was actually used to carry incense into it: the altar was to stand in front of the ark of the covenant (which was behind the vail), between the candlestick and the table, was sprinkled with blood on the day of atonement, as well as the mercy seat, and thus stands in a peculiar relation to the inner sanctuary. So also it is assigned (1 Kings 6 : 22) to the Holy of Holies ("*The altar that was by the oracle*"), a passage which Keil and Delitzsch regard as explaining our passage and explained by it. Add to this that an article of so much importance would hardly be omitted in the enumeration of the leading objects in the sanctuary, while in the general rhetorical statement of the author the *local* relation is of much less importance than the *moral*, and we can hardly doubt that the 'altar of incense' and not the 'censer' is the object here spoken of. (For a fuller discussion the reader is referred to Bleek, Delitzsch, Alford, Moll, Farrar.) **And the ark of the covenant** (Exod. 25 : 10, seq.; 37 : 1, seq.) **overlaid round about,** *covered round on all sides.* (within and without) **with gold.** A chest of acacia wood, contained not only in the inner sanctuary of the tabernacle, but also of the temple of Solomon, from which it disappeared when the temple was sacked by the Chaldeans. In 2 Macc. 2 : 1–8, the tabernacle, the ark, and the altar of incense are classed together. **Wherein** (that is, in the ark) **was the** (*a*) **golden pot having the manna.** (Exod. 16 : 32-36.) The

[1] The adjective is not ἁγία feminine agreeing with σκηνή, but ἅγια neuter plural, *holy things*, something holy.

[2] The form θυσιαστήριον, with or without additions, is indeed used in the Septuagint for the incense altar, but on the other hand, θυμιατήριον became common in later Hellenistic writers, and is found in Philo. Josephus, Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, etc., and might, therefore, well be so used by our author.

5 And over it the cherubim of glory shadowing the mercy seat; of which we cannot now speak particularly.
6 Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service *of God*.

5 tables of the covenant; and above it cherubim of glory overshadowing [1]the mercy-seat; of which
6 things we cannot now speak severally. Now these things having been thus prepared, the priests go in continually into the first tabernacle, accomplishing

1 Gr. *the propitiatory.*

'golden' is not in the Hebrew, but is added by the Septuagint. It is also not expressly stated in Exodus that it was to be placed *in* the ark, but laid up 'before the Lord' from which the other was inferred, and was so understood by the Rabbins. The statement (1 Kings 8:9; 2 Chron. 5:10) that nothing was found in the ark in the temple but the tables of the covenant, proves nothing in regard to the original contents of the ark under Moses, unless indeed, that something else was *expected* to be found there, and in so far it is confirmatory of our passage. **And Aaron's rod that budded** (*blossomed*). (Num. 17:1-11.) This was to be laid up "before the testimony," that is, before the tables of the covenant (Exod. 31:18), whence the natural inference that it was in the ark. **And the tables of the covenant**—the tables of stone which contained the Ten Commandments (Exod. 25:16) were to be placed in the ark, which, from its containing them, was called the ark of the covenant.

5. And over (*above*) **it**—on the massive golden cover of the ark—**the cherubim of glory,** the symbolical fourfold animal forms, at its two extremities, facing each other, and looking down upon the cover which they overshadowed with their outspread wings. They were called "cherubim of glory," not so much probably on account of their own glorious and shining forms, wrought of fine gold, as because they ministered to the glorious Being who was "enthroned between the cherubim." (1 Sam. 4:4; Ps. 99:1; Isa. 66:1.) **Shadowing the mercy seat.** Shadowing with their wings the massive covering of the ark, which covering, interposed, as it were, between the glory of God above and the tables of the covenant below, when sprinkled over with the blood of the propitiatory sacrifice, was transformed from a cover for that law which worketh the wrath of God into a symbol of propitiation, a mercy seat, and thus, as the divine footstool, became the place where the God of the covenant could and did hold converse with the people of the covenant. (Exod. 25:22; Lev. 16:2.) **Of** (*concerning*) **which things** (not the cherubim merely, but all the objects connected with the sanctuary) **we cannot now speak particularly** (*severally*). This general notice of them answered the writer's purpose. But why has he spoken of these details, which have no essential relation to the argument? We may answer that in describing the interior of the tabernacle it was *natural* to mention briefly its chief objects of interest; but the especial purpose of the mention probably was—by showing with what objects of sacred interest the earthly tabernacle was furnished, and thus with what dignity invested—to enhance the glory which must invest the upper and true, the 'greater and more perfect' tabernacle.

(*g*) Now in the outer sanctuary the priests performed constant ministrations, but into this inner sanctuary the high priest went alone once a year, *not without blood*—he carried in there the blood of slaughtered victims, symbolically, though not really expiatory of sin. (6–10.)

6. Now when these, etc., *and these things having been thus arranged, into the first tabernacle, indeed, the priests continually enter accomplishing the services.* Of what *time* is the author speaking? Of the time now actually present to himself and his readers, and of the temple worship now actually existing; or does he refer to the origin of the Levitical institutions, and to the state of things connected with the tabernacle itself? It seems to me most clearly the latter. I do not see how we can escape from the obvious, and indeed express, import of the language of this passage, "These things having been thus arranged, into the first tabernacle, indeed, the priests continually enter." It represents the one as immediately and naturally following upon the other, and the reference of the whole to the tabernacle worship is unmistakably clear. Nor can anything be more natural than that the author in describing the arrangements of the Old Covenant worship should go back to the primitive forms of the institution, and exhibit them as they originally came fresh from the prescription of Jehovah. Nor is this throwing back of himself into the past in the slightest degree uncommon or unnatural. It

7 But into the second *went* the high priest alone once | 7 the services; but into the second the high priest

is one of the most frequent of figures, and is nowhere more appropriate than precisely in the present case. I do not, then, I confess, see how able commentators (as Lünemann, Delitzsch, Alford) can suppose that the author is here speaking *chronologically* of the temple service as actually existing in his own time: *how* he can be supposed to have passed with so abrupt a bound, from his elaborate description of the Mosaic tabernacle, and that too with such a phrase as, "And these things having been thus arranged," to the temple worship of his own day. And this the more from the fact that the temple worship of his day, if existing at all (as we suppose it was), existed illegitimately. The True Priest had come and displaced the old. The true sacrifice had been offered, and nullified the office of the old sacrifices. Christ had already entered into the true tabernacle, had rent at his death the vail which separates the outer from the inner sanctuary, and had abolished forever that state of things which that vail and that tabernacle typified. To suppose then that the author has reference chronologically to the time now existing to himself and his readers, is to throw the whole passage into inextricable confusion. For nothing can be clearer than that he is describing the normal state of things under the Old Covenant, and the old priesthood. He is showing its significance and its imperfections. He is showing that it symbolized a state of things which was to be done away by the sacrifice and Priest of the New Covenant. But that sacrifice has now been offered: that Priest has now taken his place in the heavenly sanctuary; the rites of Judaism have but a waning, doubtful, and illegitimate existence. According to the interpretation which I am opposing, the Holy Spirit has not (ver. 8) even yet in the time of the author, shown the way into the Holiest of All, which, however, most assuredly was made manifest with the death and resurrection of Jesus. Verses 9, 10, also clearly point to a normal, established condition of things before the coming of Christ, and one which was to be done away by his coming. The whole passage, therefore, from ver. 1 to ver. 10 must, it seems to me, be interpreted of the tabernacle worship as originally ordained by God, and instituted by Moses; simply because the author chooses to take Judaism in its original and purest form; and to him the subsequent transfer of the service of the tabernacle to the temple is a thing of no moment. He is not dealing with the successive, chronological stages of Judaism; he simply takes it in its primitive, normal, character. To charge him with ignorance of the transfer of the tabernacle to the temple service, as Bleek and others have done; or with ignorance of the actual state of things, as not knowing that the original contents of the ark did not exist in the later temple, is simply to misconceive utterly his point of view, and then make the ignorance of the interpreter the ground for an imputation of ignorance on the author. For this oft-repeated charge against the author of ignorance regarding the arrangements of the temple at Jerusalem, there is not in this passage, carefully examined, the shadow of a ground. He has made no approach to an intimation that the actual tabernacle service existed in his own day, and far less, that the original contents of the tabernacle were still existing either in tabernacle or temple. By a natural and beautiful figure he transports himself back into the past, sketches in a few strong lines the ancient tabernacle in its material splendor, then in its priestly services, then (9, 10) in its symbolical significance; and not one word, not a hint, regarding the temple of Jerusalem, as of course every Jew would know precisely what outward but non-essential modifications that original tabernacle service had undergone. I would add, finally, that in treating the present here as simply the *historical present*, I concur with Chrysostom, Theophylact, Stein, Bengel, and others.

7. But into the second [*tabernacle*], *once in the year, alone, enters the high priest.* The lovers of fault-finding have here again charged error upon the author, because in fact, on the great day of atonement, the high priest entered the inner sanctuary at least *twice*, according to Lev. 16: 12–16, and according to Philo; and four times, according to the Talmud and the Rabbins. It would seem an obvious suggestion that the mind of the writer is on the fact that but on a *single day and single occasion* in the year did any one, and then only the high priest, enter this interior

every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and *for* the errors of the people:
8 The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing:

alone, once in the year, not without blood, which he offereth for himself, and for the [1] errors of the people: 8 the Holy Spirit this signifying, that the way into the holy place hath not yet been made manifest,

1 Gr. *ignorances.*

tabernacle, and whether at this single time he might have occasion to go in and out once, twice, or four times was wholly immaterial to the purpose, and substantial accuracy, of the statement. Its spirit is fulfilled in the fact that his entrance into it was confined to that single day. The outer tabernacle was frequented by all the priests in their daily ministrations: the inner was entered only on one day of the year, and then by the high priest alone. **Not without blood which he offered for** (*on behalf of*) **himself and** *for* **the errors** (*offences*) **of the people.** The author here nearly reaches the point toward which, from 8: 3, he has been steadily tending. He there undertook to show what our great High Priest in the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man, *must offer*. For this purpose he has looked back to the function of his earthly type, and finds that the high priest entered the symbolical presence of God in the Mosaic tabernacle '*not without blood*'; the offering of the heavenly High Priest, he proceeds presently to state, must be blood also. He is speaking not of the previous sacrifice, but of the bringing of the blood of the sacrifice into the Most Holy Place before God. The blood of the slaughtered victims was brought in, and sprinkled once upward, and seven times downward toward the mercy seat, and over the altar of incense, and was poured out on the altar of burnt offering. The importance attached to the entering with blood, is shown by the emphatic form of the statement, '*not without blood*,' instead of the direct affirmation, *with blood*. Before proceeding to his deduction regarding the nature of Christ's offering, the author yet pauses to dwell a moment on the symbolical significance of this exclusion of all but the high priest, and of him at all ordinary times from the inner sanctuary.

8. The Holy Ghost, etc., *the Holy Spirit showing this*—by this rare and solitary entrance—*that the way into the sanctuary;* not (as Alford) the way into the heavenly sanctuary, which would make a confusion of the figure; but the way into the presence of God which this earthly sanctuary substantially denotes. It is clear that so long as only the high priest, and he only at distant intervals, can enter the sanctuary, so long the way into the sanctuary has not as yet been strictly laid open; it remains substantially hidden and closed—*hath not yet been made manifest, while the first tabernacle is yet existing.* Bengel, Stuart, and some others, regard 'the first tabernacle' here as the earlier, or Jewish tabernacle, in contradistinction from the later or true tabernacle into which Christ has entered; but without doubt, erroneously. In the first place, the author would not without a good reason depart from his previous use of 'the first' verses 2, 6, in both of which it denotes the first in locality, that which was first entered, the outer tabernacle. Secondly, according to his conception of the relation of the Mosaic and the heavenly tabernacle, he would not have called the former the first, it being, in his figurative language, but a copy of the archetypal, original heavenly tabernacle, and therefore not the first, but the second. Thirdly, the idea is equally well brought out by giving to 'the first tabernacle' its previous signification. It is indeed true, that the way into the real presence of God, the heavenly sanctuary, was not made manifest, and was not to be made manifest while the Jewish tabernacle and its successor, the temple, yet had continuance. For so long as they existed, they existed as a part and a centre of that Judaistic system which was but the shadow of the good things to come. But, on the other hand, the idea is equally well, and even more forcibly expressed by referring the "first tabernacle" to the *first part* of the Jewish tabernacle, in distinction from the second. For what made that *first* tabernacle? What made the distinction of first and second tabernacles at all? It was the vail hanging between them, and shutting out the first from the symbolical presence of God. So long as that vail hung there that first tabernacle remained. When the vail was rent at the death of Christ (the vail of the temple answering to the vail of the tabernacle), the distinction was

9 Which *was* a figure for the time then present, in | 9 while as the first tabernacle is yet standing; which

done away, the outer tabernacle was no more; the presence of God was equally unvailed to all worshipers. Finally, the ascribing of these arrangements, or rather of the revelation made by them, to the *Holy Spirit*, is in accordance with the fact that he is the recognized Author and Source of all proper spiritual teachings. Not that the Holy Spirit in distinction from the other persons in the Trinity was the Author of the Mosaic institutions, but that the *disclosure of truth* made in them, as in all other revelations of Scripture, is properly to be attributed to the Holy Spirit. God creates and governs, and God prescribed the arrangements of the Mosaic tabernacle; Christ atones, mediates, and when on earth, like the prophets, outwardly taught; but to unvail *truth* to the understanding, and write it on the heart, is the province of the Holy Spirit, and as he alone gave efficacy to the instructions of Jesus, so he was the proper Interpreter of the significance of the Mosaic institutions.

9. Which—the first or outer tabernacle: for to this, or the leading previous idea, is the more natural reference—*is* **a figure** (*or parable*, παραβολή, *a laying along side of*, a comparison, a resemblance; here a symbolical representation) *for the time now present* (or the *now existing period*)—that is, the period during which the outer tabernacle remains with its imperfect ritual, indicating that the way into the Holy of Holies has not yet been disclosed. The time called the 'existing' or 'present' time, is the same as in the remainder of the passage, and is *not* the time now present to the writer, but the time into which he has in thought transported himself; namely, the time of the Old Covenant, and of the tabernacle and temple worship. To take any other view of it is hopelessly to confuse the passage. To refer it to the actual existing time of the writer is wholly inconsistent with the facts of the case; for now the time of that symbolical service has passed away; the 'time of rectification' has actually come, and the tabernacle and temple service has lost its validity and its significance. Assuredly the author would not use such language as he employs here in verses 8, 9, 10, regarding the mere dying remains of the temple service, which dragged out a tolerated and illegitimate existence until broken up by the final overthrow of the Jewish city and temple. He clearly has reference to Judaism as a normal, divinely instituted, divinely perpetuated system: to Judaism in all its original and proper force and significance: to Judaism in contrast with that system which came in with the death and resurrection of Christ, that fulfilled and set aside its shadowy symbolical predecessor. The author lived in the 'time of rectification,' and we cannot confound this with the 'existing time' in which this merely symbolical and carnal system had sway, without violating every law of interpretation. It may indeed well be that the long existence through centuries of that old Mosaic ritual; that its actual existence, though in a dying state, in the time of the author himself—may have rendered more easy and natural the figure by which he represents the past as if it were present; but if so, he certainly has no special and primary reference to the present time, but is distinctly contrasting a system which belongs properly to the past, which had been already virtually and substantially displaced, with another system, which since the coming of Christ, or at least since his ascension to the throne and presence of God, has been fully inaugurated, and is now in full activity. The "now existing period," then, is not the actual, but the ideal now, the period into which the author has ideally transported himself, in which the Old Covenant with its symbolical sacrifices and priesthood has yet unbroken sway, and the outer tabernacle with its unremoved vail yet symbolizes the separation of man from God, which can be removed only in Christ.[1] One remark further. The signifi-

[1] It will be seen that with this interpretation, I can attach little or no value to this passage as indicating the time of the composition of the Epistle, whether before or after the destruction of Jerusalem. I grant, indeed, that the passage may more probably have been written while the old Levitical worship had yet a nominal continuance, though I concede even as much as that with hesitation, for I certainly see no reason of weight why the whole passage may not have been written after the entire temple service had passed away, and this all the more as the special *form* of the Old Covenant service upon which the author dwells,

which was shown with glory and excellence, and was not made void by it, but on the contrary, as pointing to the future, as preparing for it, and securing it.

In these words may be traced the doctrine, and the warnings, and several references, implied or made with the view of other words.

is a figure for the new glorious dispensation, which was shown with glory and excellence, and was not made void by it, but on the contrary, as pointing to the future, as preparing for it, and securing it. Under the words may be traced the doctrine, and the warnings, and several references, implied or made with the view of other words.

under subjection here to the outer universe seems entirely overruled by the fact. There was no more expressive feature of the Old Covenant arrangements than that which personally symbolized an alienated enjoyment, and distant God; none more calculated to keep up in the hearts of the worshippers the sense of their need of a more effectual sacrifice than they could bring, and of a higher priesthood than that which was itself shown, every recorded time the presence of God, and which could not bring the people near at all. The rending of that veil, the throwing open of the inner sanctuary, is also the one great accompaniment of the crucifixion. The darkness, the earthquake, the heaven-piercing cloud, the rocks that rent, are not in that opening of graves which pointed to the resurrection, but still more in that rending of the veil, which showed that a way was now opened by which men could draw near to God. **In which, etc.** According to which [possibility], [order], or in which time [of which] the entire tenor of which good news, enough with [covenant]. Between us. I prefer the former. **We** (are) **offered both gifts and sacrifices,** that cannot as touching the conscience, make him who performs the service perfect. By [him who performs the service] is here meant not the priest but him who from the people renders service through the priest. This clause explains how it is that the inner tabernacle is a symbol for the present—a symbol not of its perfect, though (as we shall be [now enough] and not perhaps an impossible interpretation, but a symbol for the existing time—that the way of things in heaven [not the way of things in heaven but the worshipper—a symbol of that covenant have [not which] must necessarily exist when there were no [not] [the] [would] [only] [to] [the] [time] [that] [were] [able] [to] [perfect] [in] [the] [conscience] [of] [him] [who] [worshipped] [but] [was] [still] [under] [the] [law] [of] [ceremonies] [which] [stood] [only] [in] [meats] [and] [drinks] [and] [various] [washings] [and] [carnal] [ordinances] [imposed] [on] [them] [until] [the] [time] [of] [reformation]. With this enumeration [meats, drinks, etc.] agrees the sacrificial rules which these gifts and sacrifices are offered, namely the whole round of ceremonial purifications and ritual observances partly such as are enjoined by the law, and partly especially in the case of priests, as well as many of the ceremonies of baptisms [or washings]. See Matt. 23 : 23 ; Rom. 14 : 21 ; Acts 15 : 10, 28 and a few [other] [and] [less] [ceremonies] [of] [ordinary] [usage]. There is [no] [necessity] [with Rose and De Wette], to suppose a reference to the Passover, or to the [one] [day] [of] [atonement], which was [to] [be] [quite] [an] [exception] [to] [the] [regularity] [of] [the] [priest's] [ministrations]. Certain [of] [these] [ordinances] [were] [peculiar] [to] [Levites] [and] [priests], [and] [were] [imposed] [on] [the] [people] [only] [at] [certain] [and] [occasional] [times]. **Imposed** [on them] [upon] [them] [and] [not] [passing] [heavily] [on] [the] [people] [a] [most] [ordinary] [and] [customary] [observance] [according] [to] [Acts] [15] : [10] [the] [yoke] [upon] [the] [necks] [of] [disciples] [a] [yoke] [etc.] These observances were [various] [in] [their] [nature] [and] [frequent] [repetition] [and] [all] [were] [to] [their] [more] [important] [in] [character] [and] [purify] [the] [flesh]. **The time of**

that if the ceremonials had any more [good] [even] [of] [which] [but] [a] [sense] [the] [matter] [to] [be] [spiritual] [which] [is] [in] [itself] [remedial]. I [shall] [show] [that] [the] [ceremonies] [in] [the] [Levitical] [economy] [a] [purpose] [the] [spiritual] [but] [did] [not] [make] [men] [to] [perfect], [though] [they] [were] [to] [be] [perfect] [in] [the] [conscience] [of] [him] [who] [worshipped] [but] [was] [still] [under] [the] [law] [of] [ceremonies] [which] [stood] [only] [in] [meats] [and] [drinks] [and] [various] [washings] [and] [carnal] [ordinances] [imposed] [on] [them] [until] [the] [time] [of] [reformation]. With this enumeration [meats, drinks, etc.] agrees the sacrificial rules which these gifts and sacrifices are offered, namely the whole round of ceremonial purifications and ritual observances partly such as are enjoined by the law, and partly especially in the case of priests, as well as many of the ceremonies of baptisms [or washings]. See Matt. 23 : 23 ; Rom. 14 : 21 ; Acts 15 : 10, 28 and a few [other] [and] [less] [ceremonies] [of] [ordinary] [usage]. There is [no] [necessity] [with Rose and De Wette], to suppose a reference to the Passover, or to the [one] [day] [of] [atonement], which was [to] [be] [quite] [an] [exception] [to] [the] [regularity] [of] [the] [priest's] [ministrations]. Certain [of] [these] [ordinances] [were] [peculiar] [to] [Levites] [and] [priests], [and] [were] [imposed] [on] [the] [people] [only] [at] [certain] [and] [occasional] [times]. **Imposed** [on them] [upon] [them] [and] [not] [passing] [heavily] [on] [the] [people] [a] [most] [ordinary] [and] [customary] [observance] [according] [to] [Acts] [15] : [10] [the] [yoke] [upon] [the] [necks] [of] [disciples] [a] [yoke] [etc.] These observances were [various] [in] [their] [nature] [and] [frequent] [repetition] [and] [all] [were] [to] [their] [more] [important] [in] [character] [and] [purify] [the] [flesh]. **The time of**

[I have argued in nothing [necessary] [sense] [of] [conscience] [only] [to] [these] [ceremonies] [pertained] [to] [the] [flesh]. [The] [law] [by] [the] [spiritual] [to] [the] [conscience] [of] [a] [worshipper] [as] [we] [see] [in] [the] [Epistle].

rectification,' of correction and setting to rights, the Messianic season, the time when the one true sacrifice sweeps away all these numerous sacrifices and the whole burdensome ceremonial in which they are imbedded;—that time begins with the coming, at least with the sacrifice and priesthood, of Christ. Then these observances, these sacrifices, along with the first or outer tabernacle with which they stand connected, and which in its expressive import declares their impotence, are swept away together. The rending of the vail has merged the first tabernacle in the second, and under the conduct of the great High Priest, opened to all the worshipers the way to the presence of God. Of course, I reject wholly the idea of Delitzsch, Alford, etc., that this time of revision and thorough setting to rights is identical with the 'existing season' (καιρὸς ἐνεστηκώς) above. I regard the two as placed in direct contrast. The one is the time present to the conception of the writer, the time of the Old Covenant and the material tabernacle, when symbol, and shadow, and fleshly ordinances had sway: the other is the now existing time, the time described in the verses following since Christ has appeared, the efficient Priest of good things to come, rending the vail, opening the way to God, substituting the heavenly for the earthly tabernacle, and his own blood in priestly sacrifice and offering for that of goats and heifers. Whatever else in the Christian's hope may be future, this is not. It has actually come. As an ideal system it has come completely in the sacrifice and mediation of Christ. To confound it, then, with that previous time of symbols and shadows is to overturn the whole doctrine of the Epistle, and all this because we fail to recognize the natural and familiar figure of the historical present for the past in verses 1–10, a figure to which his reference to the tabernacle worship absolutely forces us. I will say once more it seems to me inconceivable, that, if the writer were referring in all this to the actual present time, he would have made no single allusion to the temple; none whatever to the disappearance of so many of the objects which, although in the tabernacle, were some of them never in the first, and still fewer of them ever in the second temple. The minuteness with which he describes the Mosaic tabernacle and its arrangements; the close connection to which his language points between those arrangements and the consequent priestly service ('these things having been thus arranged, the priests enter,' etc.—show that he is speaking of the Levitical service in its normal character, as legitimated by divine appointment and sanction, not as dragging out a miserable existence after being smitten down and substantially done away in Christ. On the common hypothesis it is difficult to see how we can defend the author from those charges of carelessness or of ignorance which (be he who he might have been, Paul, Apollos, Barnabas, Luke, Clement,) are antecedently, utterly improbable, and which when we adopt the right interpretation, recoil upon those that made them.

(*h*) We see, then, what is demanded of our High Priest. It is *blood*. And as his is the true, and not the symbolical priesthood, as he is in the genuine, and not the copied sanctuary, he must offer blood that is really, and not symbolically, cleansing. He brings *his own*. (11–14.)

The author reaches now the solution of the problem proposed in 8 : 3; namely, to determine what it is that our heavenly High Priest has to offer. In the outer earthly sanctuary the priests minister daily with various offerings: into the second sanctuary the high priest goes alone once a year, *and not without blood;* this jealous exclusion showing that the way into the All-holy has not yet been disclosed; but this condition of the rare and solitary entrance showing how, when it *is* disclosed, access is to be secured; namely, by *blood:* by blood which will perform, really and effectually, what the blood of animals performs symbolically. With this comes the crown and consummation of the argument. All, from this point on to 10 : 18 (the close of the argumentative part of the Epistle) is in illustration of this one thought, as all from 8 : 1 (where the discussion of the high priesthood commences) is preparatory to it. Thus two grand ideas, Christ a Melchisedec Priest, holding a royal and perpetual priesthood, and Christ an Aaronic High Priest, bringing his efficacious blood into the heavenly sanctuary; these are the two grand points on which the doctrinal discussion of the Epistle turns. Without the priesthood which, after the type of Melchisedec, is constituted 'after the power of an indestructible life,' the high priesthood would be unavailing: without the *blood* typified in the Levitical sacrifice, the Melchisedec priesthood, though majestic, would be barren. The two united give us a High

10 but Christ being come a high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building;

11 But Christ having come a high priest of [1] the good things to come, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say,
12 not of this creation, nor yet through the blood of

[1] Some ancient authorities read the good things that are come.

Priest answering all our needs, able to commune and carry to perfection our spiritual cleansing and salvation—able to bring a guilty soul, ransomed and purified, *into the presence of God.*

11. But Christ being come (*presenting himself*) equivalent to, being raised up, appearing on the theatre of the world, not, probably, 'presenting himself at the heavenly sanctuary,' and certainly not 'becoming High Priest.'[1] It is placed, says Delitzsch, emphatically first, as marking in his coming, the goal of Old Testament prophecy, the turning point of two periods of sacred history standing related to each other as prophecy and fulfilment. Thus again the reference is not strictly to the *incarnation* of Christ, but to his *coming forward* at the close of the Old Economy to inaugurate a New One, and coming forward in the exercise of all the functions of the High Priest. It thus marks his whole collective work as Messiah; his incarnation, sacrificial death, ascension. **A high priest of** (*the*) **good things to come.** Are the 'good things' of which Christ is the High Priest called 'to come' (μελλόντων, from the point of view of the Old Covenant, or from the present point of view of the believer who as yet is saved only in *hope*: who awaits his full salvation at Christ's second appearing (9:28), who has here no abiding city but seeks one to come (τὴν μέλλουσαν 13:14)? It would seem at first more natural to regard the author as speaking of Christ's high priesthood as the fulfilment of the good things which did not yet exist, but were only promised and symbolized under Judaism, and this idea may perhaps be secondarily in his mind. Still the second idea is (with Tholuck, De Wette, Lünemann, Delitzsch, etc.,) doubtless the true one. They are the good things future from the New Testament point of view. The Mosaic tabernacle had its sanctuary, *belonging to the world* (κοσμικόν); the system of which it was the centre consisted of meats and drinks and carnal ordinances, earthly, temporal, and transient. But the Christian's High Priest is a High Priest of good things to come, of a future, spiritual salvation, of heavenly blessings as yet possessed but in hope. Alford therefore errs in alleging that the clause 'high priest of good things to come,' describes a quality common both to the Jewish high priest and to Christ; only that the import of the phrase was much scantier in the one case, and much fuller in the other. In a certain sense, of course, such a statement might be made. The seeds of the New Dispensation were in the Old. But it would reverse all the author's habits of conception and language to designate a Jewish high priest along with Christ, "a high priest *of* good things to come." The very phrase which Alford cites disproves it. The law had but the *shadow* of good things to come, and therefore the priest of the law was but a priest *of* shadows; he ministered to that tabernacle which was but a copy and shadow of the heavenly. The author is here speaking contrastively of Christ's higher priesthood, as ministering and bestowing the spiritual blessings which were utterly beyond the reach of the Levitical: this could faintly outline and symbolize them: but could by no means bestow them. Real pardon, complete redemption, nearness and assimilation to God, promised now potentially, but fully only in the future, are the "coming good things of which Christ is High Priest."

Through a (*the* **greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building,** *creation.* We here (as at 8:2) meet the question: "What is the tabernacle referred to by the author?" Is it the first or outer tabernacle, as distinguished from the inner or Holy of Holies, and if so as assumed by nearly all commentators), then what did that outer tabernacle represent? Through *what* did Christ pass, as the greater and more perfect tabernacle, on his way into the heavenly Holy of Holies? I have already considered the question at some length at 8:2, and might to that refer the reader for the exclusive discussion. The importance of the topic, however, and the almost unanimous concurrence of interpreters in what seems to

[1] The word rejects previous forms of interpretation.

me a grave error, may justify some additional observations.

I do not believe (and in this I have the authority of Moll) that the author, either here, or at 8 : 2, or anywhere in his reference to the heavenly sanctuary, makes reference to the first, or outer tabernacle, at all. I do not believe that he conceives of it as having any existence under the Spiritual Dispensation. Certainly there is nothing in the language, either at 8: 2 or here, which would lead us to suppose that he refers rather to *a part* of the tabernacle than to the whole of it. The "greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands," would *seem* to be contrasted as a whole, with the smaller, imperfect, and material earthly structure. Apart from the fact that Christ went through it into the sanctuary, none would dream of applying the description to but a *part*, and that confessedly the far inferior part of that tabernacle. Had the expression been indefinite, '*a* greater and more perfect,' etc., instead of '*the* greater,' it could be more easily referred to a part of either tabernacle. Again (with Moll), to what purpose the emphatic words, 'through the greater and more perfect tabernacle,' if it referred to but some mere passage way to the heavenly tabernacle, and not to the heavenly tabernacle itself? The application of the terms, 'greater and more perfect,' as applied to the heavenly tabernacle as a whole, in contrast with the earthly, we can easily understand; but see no reason for this emphasizing of that which was but a mere passage way to the interior sanctuary.

But the case appears still stronger when we ask, "What *is* this greater and more perfect *outer* tabernacle, through which our High Priest passes to the inner?" And we hear the responses of interpreters — "The lower and visible heavens;" "the heaven of glorified saints;" "the earthly life of Christ;" "the human body of Christ;" "his glorified body;" "his mystical body,"—these are chief among the numerous answers given to this difficult question. But however true it might be, that in some sort of sense either one of these might be the passage way to the heavenly sanctuary, neither of them has the slightest support in the language of the author; neither of them is anything better than pure conjecture: and neither of them (nor can I except that of Delitzsch, 'the heaven of glorified saints') has any support in the significance of the outer earthly tabernacle, or stands in any sort of relation to it. That outer tabernacle had one single special purpose and import. It did not represent the visible heavens, nor the heaven of the blessed, nor the human body, nor the earthly life, nor the glorified body, nor the mystical body of Christ. Its import is expressly given by the author. It was the symbol and likeness for the time then existing, in which conscious sin and guilt, united with a carnal ritual that had no expiatory and cleansing power, kept men at a distance from God. It was a symbol of imperfection. It was the grand central feature, the very core, so to speak, of the shadowy Levitical Dispensation. The Holy Ghost signified by solemn and expressive symbol so long as this 'first' or outer tabernacle 'had position,' that the way into the true sanctuary had not yet been disclosed. Its destiny then was obvious. If the way into the Holiest of All was not made manifest while it remained, a condition of the disclosing of that way must be its annihilation. And such was the fact. The high priestly sacrifice of our Lord destroyed it. His death rent the symbolical vail, and merged the outer and inner tabernacle into one. When Christ therefore ascended and entered into the heavenly Holy of Holies, he did not pass through the outer tabernacle, because he could not. It had ceased to exist. His own death had done it away forever, in doing away with that state of things which it symbolized. To refit it, and to place it in the heavens, is to ignore the cardinal imperfection of the Old, and the vital fact and prerogative of the New Economy. It is to repair and rehang the rent vail of the temple.

But are we not going directly counter to that statement of the author, in which he declares that the earthly tabernacle was a copy of the heavenly, citing in confirmation the language: "See that thou make all things after the pattern shown to thee in the mount"? In regard to this, I again reply, that the original import of this language can of course have been nothing more than that Moses should exactly copy the model which God had given to him on Sinai. Our author makes a purely figurative application of that passage, as a quasi proof or illustration of his doctrine, that the true arche-

12 Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption *for us*.

goats and calves, but through his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained

typal tabernacle is in heaven and not on earth; that the true high priest is Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, and not Aaron in the earthly. But that he meant anything more by it; that he meant that there was anything in the heavenly arrangements actually corresponding to the outer or even to the inner tabernacle,—seems wholly void of probability. I can scarcely conceive that he meant anything more than that Christ has the true divine high priesthood of which the Levitical high priesthood is but the type and copy, and therefore in figurative language it is natural to say that he ministers in the true heavenly tabernacle of which that is the earthly copy and semblance. Thus, 'the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man,' and 'the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is, not of this creation,' both mean substantially the same thing, and both refer not to the outer tabernacle distinctively, but simply to Christ's spiritual priestly service in the presence of God; they belong to the heavenly Sion, and the heavenly Jerusalem, in comparison with the earthly Sinai, and the earthly Jerusalem. (12:22.) The New Testament tabernacle is among the spiritual existences of the New Covenant, and it is inconceivable that the two emphatic characterizations of its spiritual and transcendent dignity in our author should have reference, not to the whole tabernacle, or the tabernacle in its noblest features, but only to that part of it which symbolized the imperfection and powerlessness of the economy with which it stood connected.

How, then, explain the construction 'through the greater and more perfect tabernacle entered into the sanctuary'? We may construct it in either one of two ways. We may connect it (with Moll) with the preceding: 'Christ is an *high priest* (ἀρχιερεύς), through (that is, *by means of*) the greater and more perfect sanctuary.' This is explained by 8:4, 5, where we are told that if Christ were on earth he could not be a priest, there being a sacerdotal order already to perform the services of the law; and therefore *he could be a priest only* as he could minister in the heavenly and archetypal tabernacle, and thus could be a priest only *through* that tabernacle. Or there is no serious difficulty, I think, in taking the *through* (διά) *locally*, and connecting it with the following verb *entered* (εἰσῆλθεν). Regarding the heavenly tabernacle under the figure of an edifice in which is the Holy of Holies, Christ might be said in a general way to enter through that greater and more perfect tabernacle, that is, to enter through its door, through its entrance, into the sanctuary, and thus the author not mean to affirm anything in that tabernacle corresponding to the outer tabernacle on earth. Of these two constructions, we may add that the former seems favored by ver. 12, "nor through the blood," etc., which it is also quite as natural and perhaps more so, to construct with '*high priest*' (ἀρχιερεύς).

12. Neither by (*and not through*) **the blood of goats and calves, but,** *through* **his own blood.** This clause may, as just observed, be constructed (as by Moll) with the preceding 'high priest'—a high priest through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, and a high priest not through the blood, etc.—denoting the necessary conditions of Christ's high priesthood, or it may be connected with the following verb 'entered' (εἰσῆλθεν), and denote that through which, or with which, Christ as High Priest entered the heavenly sanctuary. The Levitical high priest entered the earthly one both by means of and with the blood of goats and heifers: Christ entered the heavenly one through, though not strictly with, his own blood. Probably, therefore, the preposition is carefully chosen as one applicable (as σύν *with* would not have been) both to the entrance of the typical and the antitypical High Priest. The author shrinks from the harshness of saying that Christ entered the presence of God *with* his own blood, but says *through*, or *by means of* it.

The German commentators, indeed, discuss at length the question of the way in which Christ can be said to have gone into the All-holy Place with or by his own blood. They inquire whether the blood which he shed on the cross was wasted on the ground, or gathered up, as too precious to be lost, and restored to his body; or whether those drops

were suffered to sink into the ground in expiation of the curse, and the drops remaining in his body were reanimated along with it (so Delitzsch); and whether he accordingly entered heaven with a glorified body which contains blood (Delitzsch), or without blood (Hofmann). To me, I confess, these speculations seem, if not utterly idle and vain, and an almost presumptuous prying into inscrutable mysteries, to have at least no important bearing on the passage before us. I do not see any necessity for supposing that the writer conceives of Christ as entering the heavenly tabernacle with actual *blood*. This part of the representation (if indeed it is made at all) must be purely figurative. There must be a slaughtered victim, and in the symbolical Levitical service the blood of this victim is carried into the sanctuary, and sprinkled toward the mercy seat, and poured out on the altar of burnt offering. This is a vivid reminder of the necessity of *blood*—that is, of the necessity of *death*, of a life rendered up in expiation of the sins of men. But is not all its essential significance realized when Christ pours out his life on the cross, and then ascends to appear in the presence of God for us? Does not the merely *formal* similitude end here? Was there any virtue in this blood carried into the sanctuary, except as it stood connected with the atoning death? And has not Christ performed all that it signified when he has shed his blood on the cross for man? Must he carry, in any form, actual blood into the presence of God in the discharge of his priestly functions? To demand this is to make the parallel run on all fours; to push it to quite an unwarrantable extreme. What, then, became of the spilled, or the unspilled, blood of the Redeemer's body—whether it was all, or but a part of it shed—whether what was shed sank into the ground inoperative, or with expiatory power, or was gathered up again: and, in short, what was the relation of his precious earthly blood to his present glorified body,—are questions about which I do not believe that we can profitably speculate, and which certainly I would touch with the utmost reverence; but they surely stand in no proper relation to his high priestly function. He died to atone for our sins, and lives with God to carry forward our salvation to its completion.[1]

Entered in, etc., entered *once for all into the sanctuary*. **Having obtained,** etc., *obtaining* (εὑράμενος), finding, *procuring* an eternal redemption—that is, by his entrance; not '*having* obtained[2] previously to his entrance; the clause may be resolved by, 'entered and procured.' There lies, I think, in the middle voice no such emphasis as Alford supposes. The symbolical atonement of the Levitical service was not complete until the blood of the victim was carried into the sanctuary. The expiatory work of Christ was not complete until he himself had risen from the tomb and entered in glory the heavens, *as it were*, carrying the blood of *his* sacrifice into the heavenly presence. As before said, I do not believe that Christ's carrying actual blood into his heavenly abode, whether in or out of his spiritual body, is in any way in question (except as far as it may be a speculative question whether blood is essential to a spiritual body). (1 Cor. 15:50.) He bore the fruit, the efficacy of his atoning death, into the holy presence. He appeared there as a Lamb that had been sacrificed, and taken away the sins of the world. The *eternal* redemption or ransom corresponds to the single entrance, *once for all*. The high

[1] It seems scarcely possible to avoid the conviction that the 'greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands—that is, not of this creation,' and 'his own blood,' are intended to express the two points of superiority of Christ's priestly service over that of the Levitical priesthood. A better, to wit, *spiritual*, tabernacle as against the material earthly one, and 'his own blood' as against that of irrational animals, give to his priestly ministry an incomparable prerogative. If so, then it seems equally certain that the tabernacle thus emphatically and nobly designated, is not the 'outer tabernacle,' whether the 'lower heavens' or whatever else the ingenuity of interpreters has devised, but the true upper tabernacle, in which our Lord performs his priestly service, that which the Lord pitched, and not man.

[2] So here as in many other cases the aorist participle should be rendered, not as perfect, to which it is often (virtually) equivalent, but as our present, which is very often equal to the Greek aorist (oftener, perhaps, than to the Greek present). Thus in our Epistle 1:4, κρείττων γενόμενος, not "having become," but "becoming," in the act of taking his seat; so here not "having procured," but in the very act of entering, "procuring." Examples of both usages are abundant; take as a single case of the aorist usage, Luke 23:46, φωνήσας, where even the Revised Version has, I think, very unfortunately "when he had cried," etc., instead of "crying," etc.

13 For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the
ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to
the purifying of the flesh;
14 How much more shall the blood of Christ, who
through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot
to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve
the living God?

13 eternal redemption. For if the blood of goats and
bulls, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling them that
have been defiled, sanctify unto the cleanness of the
14 flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who
through [1] the eternal Spirit offered himself without
blemish unto God, cleanse [2] your conscience from

1 Or, *his eternal spirit*.....2 Or, *Many ancient authorities read our.*

priest entered repeatedly—that is, in connection with repeated sacrifices and repeated presentation of blood, because the redemption which he procured was but partial and temporary. Christ needs enter but once, because it is in connection with a sacrifice which is completely and finally efficacious. The price (λύτρον) of the ransom of his people—for such is the aspect under which their salvation is here presented—is paid not, as held by some Greek commentators, to Satan, but to God.

13. Confirmation of this latter statement, that his entrance procures an *eternal* redemption, by an argument from the less to the greater. This indeed may be regarded as the transition to the remaining part of the discussion of Christ's high priesthood, that; namely, which deals with the *necessity* and the *efficacy* of his offering. From the typical arrangements of the law the author inferred what must be the offering which Christ as High Priest in the true tabernacle must bring to God. He now shows that this necessity lay in the nature of the case; was foreshadowed in all the purifications of the law (15-23), and was efficacious and final. (9:23; 10:18.) He begins by setting the spiritual nature of Christ's sacrifice over against the outward and ritualistic nature of the Levitical sacrifices. **For if the blood of bulls and of goats** (Homer, "Iliad," Lib. 1, the priest of Apollo designates as his customary offerings to the God) **and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean**, *them who have been defiled.* See Num. ch. 19 for a description of the rites by which the ashes of a spotted heifer that had not borne the yoke, mingled with running water, are sprinkled upon those who were defiled by contact with a dead body, and cleanses them. 'Sprinkling them that have been defiled' is an abrupt and elliptical expression (both in Greek and English), for 'sprinkled upon them,' etc. **Sanctifieth to the purifying** (*cleanness*) **of the flesh**—that is, sanctifieth *with reference to* the cleanness of the flesh, or sanctifieth *unto*, marking the *end*, that to which the sanctification reaches. The conditional, 'If the blood sanctifieth,' implies, of course, that it does. The Levitical rites *could* go to that extent: they could cleanse the flesh really; the spirit, symbolically.

14. How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the (*an*) **eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God.** The argument is from the less to the greater, both quantitatively and qualitatively. The power of the blood of bulls and goats to do a certain work is conceded; but much more is the blood of Christ able to do a thing much greater. Such is the value attached to the blood of Christ, in comparison with that of bulls and goats, that it is far more capable of performing this incomparably higher cleansing which it undertakes, than that of these to perform their vastly inferior office. The blood of goats and heifers naturally cleanses outwardly and ceremonially; the blood of Christ naturally cleanses inwardly and spiritually. But the blood of Christ is as much more efficacious within its higher sphere of working, as that sphere itself is higher than the other.

In the difficult phrase, 'who through an eternal Spirit offered himself to God,' we may remark, first, that 'himself' is, in a degree, emphatic, and is evidently intended to contrast the conscious, voluntary, self-determining nature of the sacrifice of Christ with the unconscious, involuntary, compulsory character of animal sacrifices. The animal goes blindly, unwittingly to the slaughter, at the mere will of another; Christ, in the depths of his intelligent spiritual nature, made *himself* an offering to God. The former, then, is a merely animal act, and as such, has but a merely animal virtue; the latter is a moral, a spiritual act, and as such has a moral and spiritual efficacy. And as the one victim is offered by virtue of its perishing animal life, so the other offers himself by virtue of an eternal spirit which dwells within him, and imparts to his sacrifice a spiritual and an eternal efficacy. The 'Spirit'

here spoken of was not, then, the '*Holy Spirit*' which was abundantly shed forth upon our Lord. The term clearly points to a power and impulse acting more strictly from within, and proceeding properly from himself. It was not his purely *human spirit*, which he shared in common with other men; it was not, I think, his purely *divine nature*, which, before his incarnation, had consented to his sacrifice, and whose presence was certainly necessary to the efficacy of his offering. It involves, I conceive, that blending of his divine nature with his human personality, which forms the mystery of his being, and which gives, even to his divine acts, a certain element of humanity, and to his human acts a certain element of the divine. It is, I think, this mysterious union in which consists that "spirit of holiness," by virtue of which he was declared "the Son of God with power," on account of his resurrection from the dead. It is by virtue of this that, in contrast with the first Adam, who became a "living soul," he, the second Adam, became a "life-giving Spirit." It was thus that, though "put to death in the flesh, he was made alive in the spirit." In all these cases he is spoken of not as purely God, not as purely man. In his human spirit, as the seat of his divine nature and sharing its eternity: or in his divine nature, as having linked itself with, and drawn up into its fellowship, his human spirit, —by virtue, thus, of that spiritual nature which partook, at once, of divinity and humanity,—he offered himself to God, the sacrifice having all the efficacy which this union alone could give it. The language is strongly antithetical. The animal sacrifice, in its animal and perishable nature, can secure but a fleshly and a transient cleansing; Christ's sacrifice, through an eternal[1] spirit, can secure a spiritual and permanent purification.

I may add that here the 'offering up' is not Christ's priestly offering in the sanctuary, but his sacrificial offering on the cross. The latter is, in fact, in both the typical and the antitypical offering, the grand and essential thing. In the Levitical rite, it is true, the blood was brought into the sanctuary, and sprinkled there, but simply as *indicative* that blood—that is, death (for in the blood is the life) was demanded as an expiation for sin; and in regard to the great High Priest, we may well suppose that all, except the fact of his dying for sin, and then passing into the immediate presence of God, is a figurative accommodation to the forms of the earthly rite. In this, as in all else, the visible becomes the imperfect, but necessary, exponent of the spiritual. **Purge** (*cleanse*) **your conscience from dead works to serve the living God.** 'Your conscience'—more exactly, 'Your consciousness' (συνείδησις). The term is less abstract —it denotes more activity, a more direct and palpable relation to God than is expressed by 'conscience.' The philosophical use of the term 'conscience' as a faculty which takes cognizance of right and wrong has somewhat deadened its meaning as expressing an operative, conscious relation to God. As to '*dead* works,' all the works of unregenerate man are sinful, and as such, may be called 'dead,' springing from a nature which possesses in it no true spiritual life. Such, however, is not precisely the import of the term 'dead' here. They are probably the dead works of the law, those endeavors to fulfill both the moral and the ceremonial law, and thus work out a legal righteousness, which unrenovated humanity is ever making, but which, springing from no living principle, are devoid of life and power, and can prove no acceptable service to the *living* God. Dead works may answer for dead deities. Outward and hollow forms may satisfy the demands of idol worship. But the God who lives himself demands living worshipers and living worship; he who is spiritual, demands a spiritual, not a carnal service, and a carnal service was all that the Levitical rites proffered, and that the Old Covenant could insure.

(*i*) This spiritual efficacy of the blood of Christ warrants and demands a New Covenant, inaugurated, like the First, with blood, but the blood of a nobler victim than that of the Old; for Christ has entered into the true antitypical sanctuary, not, like the earthly high priests, for repeated entrances, but once

[1] This adjective naturally suggests that the word 'Spirit' refers to the higher and divine nature of Christ. His truly human nature, on its spiritual side, was indeed eternal as to the future, but so also is the spirit of every man. The unique and superlative value of Christ's self-sacrifice seems to have been due to the impulse of the divine side of his nature.—A. H.

15 And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions *that were* under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

15 dead works to serve the living God? And for this cause he is the mediator of a new [1]covenant, that a death having taken place for the redemption of the trangressions that were under the first [1]covenant, they that have been called may receive the promise

1 The Greek word here used signifies both *covenant* and *testament*.

for all, never to leave it until he comes without sin unto salvation. (15–28.)

15. And for this cause; namely, because he is able to perform such a spiritual, not merely ceremonial purification,—the clause looks backward, not forward,—**he is the mediator of the** (*a*) **new testament** (*covenant*). Emphasis (with Alford) not merely on *New*, but also partly on *Covenant;* Mediator of a Covenant; namely, a New One. A covenant, or testament, requires to be sealed with blood, and, in that respect, his death fits him for the purpose; and, as the Old Covenant had but a carnal ritual and carnal promises, had but the blood of bulls and goats, and was *adapted* to such a merely outward ritual, his blood, having such spiritual efficacy, may well connect itself with a New Covenant, or testament, whose demands and promises shall be proportionate to the preciousness and power of the blood which mediates it—in other words, the new and better sacrifice demands a New and better Covenant. The new wine cannot be put into old bottles; this cleansing blood cannot ally itself with the animal sacrifices of the Old Covenant, and advantage must be taken of it to secure to the heirs of promise blessings such as the Old Covenant was unable to furnish; namely, **that by means,** etc.—literally, *that a death taking place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the First Covenant.*

The Old Covenant had had plenty of deaths, but they had all been of those irrational victims that could sanctify only to the cleanness of the flesh. The transgressions of the worshipers they had no power to remove. But here is a victim of a different order—a Being who, through an eternal Spirit, has made of himself a voluntary and spiritual offering to God. It is meet that, with the seal and sanction of such cleansing blood, a New Covenant should be formed; that, the victim dying, his blood may be efficacious for the redemption and cleansing away of those sins under the First Covenant which that had only symbolically, never really, expiated; which had been passed over and winked at rather than really removed. ('Death,' although referring specifically to the death of Christ, is spoken of indefinitely as 'a death,' in order to fix attention on the abstract principle, rather than the particular application of it. 'The redemption of the transgressions' is redemption of men from their transgressions, although Hofmann explains it of the redeeming, buying off, as it were, of the transgressions themselves which, having become obnoxious to the judgments of God, involve those who commit them.) **They which are** (*that have been*) **called**—not merely the called of the New Testament, but of the Old—**might** (*may*) **receive the promise**—that is, the fulfillment, the realization of the promise—**of the eternal inheritance.**

The author has his eye, of course, on the ancient people of God, and, as in chapter 3, looks on the history of the Old and New Covenants as constituting one continuous chain. The New Covenant replaces the Old; the expiation of the New Covenant removes the sins which could not be removed by the Old. The 'eternal inheritance' of the one succeeds to the temporal inheritance of the other. The land of Canaan, the inheritance and rest of ancient Israel, as it was not the true and Sabbath rest of the people of God, so was not the true and eternal inheritance. This it was left for the New Covenant under Christ to give.

But here, briefly, two questions: First, why is the redeeming effect of the blood of Christ restricted by the author to the sins committed under the Old Covenant, and thus seemingly confined to the Jewish people? Did not all sins in all nations, from Adam down, need to be forgiven by the blood of Christ? And was there any where remission, except through his blood? Certainly not. But, to the mind of the author, the Jewish people here (as 2 : 16) represent universal humanity. It was to them immediately, on behalf of the race, that God had revealed himself; to them the promises had come; with them alone God had directly dealt. The rest of the world *seemed*, for the time being, to be without his jurisdiction; its

ignorance and its wickedness had, in a manner, been overlooked and passed by; and, as the Jewish people had been exclusively the recipients of his law, his promises, his covenant, so they would appear as primarily interested in the New Covenant, which replaces the Old. As mankind at large had no direct concern in the Sinaitic Covenant, so, apparently, not in the one which supersedes it. In fact, however, the death of Christ is equally necessary for the remission of all transgressions among all nations.

But, secondly, was there no real forgiveness of sins under the Old Covenant? Was there only that *passing by* (πάρεσις, instead of ἄφεσις, *remission*), which is spoken of in Rom. 3 : 25, so that, in reality, all sins remained unforgiven until the coming of Christ? Again, I suppose not. In the case of all the pious of the Old Testament, there was a real forgiveness of sins, but one based not, in the slightest degree, on the efficacy of the Old Testament offerings. God, in view of the atonement, always could, and always did, forgive sins, in the case of the exercise of faith, although, so far as concerned the Old Testament ritual and any power which lay in its symbols, the pardon could be only provisional, and was rather a passing over than a remission. The repetition of the sacrifices of the Old Testament was not because the sins of the really pious had not, once for all, been remitted, nor because, on the other hand, these sacrifices had the slightest power, really, to cleanse away any sins. But as they were purely typical, it was necessary, by means of them, to keep constantly before the worshiper the need of an expiation, and show at once the significance and the impotence of the rites which he was performing. The reason why the rites were so constantly repeated was not because there was any efficacy in them, but *because there was not*—because they were strictly and absolutely symbolical. They did not procure a partial pardon, or a temporary pardon, or any pardon whatever; they only pointed forward to him whose cleansing blood could take away *all* sin just because it could take away *any*. But while holding that the pious of the Old Testament were already actually forgiven, I by no means believe that they had that full *sense* of forgiveness, and with this those richer joys and hopes, which belong to the clearer light and fuller spiritual influences of the gospel. Their perceptions were dimmer and their aspirations unsatisfied. They saw through a vail, instead of a glass, and thus doubly darkly. God did not intend to make them perfect in advance of the believers of the New Testament; and thus, probably, their condition, both this side of and beyond the grave, was one of less privilege than has been allotted to believers since the coming of Christ. Finally, however, it is proper to speak of Christ's death as being for the redemption of transgressions committed under the First Covenant, as if they were not already forgiven, because their forgiveness has been conditioned entirely upon his death.

16. The idea of an 'inheritance,' so prominent in the Old Testament, and just mentioned, suggests a transition from a 'covenant' to a 'testament.' This transition is made all the more easily, and, indeed, almost imperceptibly, as it is but a gliding over to the more common meaning of the word before rendered 'covenant.' This word (διαθήκη) means, primarily, '*disposition, arrangement*,' and then a testamentary disposition, a *testament*, and, secondarily, though rarely in the classics, an arrangement with a second party (διά in composition often having this force, as διαλέγομαι, *discourse continuously* and *discourse with*; διάλογος, *dialogue*), an 'agreement,' or '*covenant*.' As then the blessings bestowed by God upon his people are spoken of both as matters of agreement and of inheritance; and, as in both cases, a *death* was equally essential to the validity of the arrangement, it is not strange that the author should slide in his usage from one to the other. In the one case, it is true, the arrangement was sealed by the death of a victim; in the other, by that of the testator. But Christ being, in the uniqueness of his character, both, and alike dying as the ratifying victim of a covenant and living as its Mediator, and also dying as the condition of his bestowing the gift of the eternal inheritance on his people, he could with equal propriety be represented under either character. Here the mention of 'inheritance' suggests his death—not as the seal of a covenant, but as the condition of the validity of a testament. The gifts, indeed, were of God; but he placed them in the hands of Christ, whose death is essential to their being made available to his people. I may add that the transition, which

16 For where a testament *is*, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator.
17 For a testament *is* of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.
18 Whereupon neither the first *testament* was dedicated without blood.
19 For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people,

16 of the eternal inheritance. For where a [1] testament is, there must of necessity [2] be the death of him who
17 made it. For a [1] testament is of force [3] where there hath been death: [4] for it doth never avail while he
18 who made it liveth. Wherefore even the first *cove-*
19 *nant* hath not been dedicated without blood. For when every commandment had been spoken by Moses unto all the people according to the law, he took the blood of the calves and the goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both

1 The Greek word here used signifies both *covenant* and *testament*....2 Gr. *be brought*.....3 Gr. *over the dead*....4 Or *for doth it ever . . . liveth?*

seems harsh in our language, which has not a common word, attracts no special notice from the Greek interpreters, who take it as a matter of course. That the transition is actually made I see no sufficient grounds to deny. Without it, verses 16 and 17 are extremely harsh, and almost unmeaning.

For where a testament is—referring to the previous statement that Christ is the Mediator of a New Covenant (διαθήκη), in order that, a *death* occurring, he might, by the spiritual efficacy of his death, bestow on the heirs of promise the blessings which the ritual sacrifices of the Old Covenant never could bestow. When he spoke of 'death' in the preceding verse, he probably thought of it in the light of a seal of a covenant; he now almost insensibly changes the point of view to that of the condition of a testament. **There must of necessity be the death of the testator.** 'Also,' of the Common Version, is to be omitted. Ebrard, denying a change from the previous meaning of 'covenant,' refers 'the testator' (διαθέμενος) to the man who, as one of the parties to the covenant, must die, either in his own person, or that of a substitute; for on no other condition can man enter into covenant with God. But it seems nearly certain that the author has here no exclusive reference to a covenant between man and God, but is rather making a general, and, as it were, axiomatic statement. **Must be** (φέρεσθαι, *be borne abroad, alleged, declared*) has here no emphasis.

17. For a testament is of force (*valid*) **after** (*when*) **men are dead**—literally, *over* (on condition of) *the dead*, of persons as dead (νεκροῖς), dead men, not dead animals. A testament never goes into force until the testator has died. It is essential to the very *idea* of a bequest. A will or testament is that which disposes of property *after death*. Property actually alienated by a person while living, no matter what the form, cannot be by testament.

Otherwise, etc.—*inasmuch as it scarcely is in force while the testator liveth.*[1]

18. Wherefore, etc.—*Whence neither has the first covenant been inaugurated without blood.* The author relapses here to the former idea of 'covenant,' turning easily on the pivot of a word common to both significations 'Inaugurated,' introduced in a formal and valid manner.

19. For when Moses, etc.—*For after every command had been spoken by Moses to all the people according to the law.* 'According to the law'—that is, which he had received on Sinai. **He took the blood of** (*the*) **calves** (*heifers*) **and of** (*the*) **goats.** The account is taken from Exod. 24: 3–8, with, however, some marked deviations. There is in Exodus no mention of 'goats,' but only of heifers, the sacrifice of goats as a sin offering being not yet established. The author, however, citing from memory, and aiming at no minute exactness, unites the two classes of heifers and goats by which he was accustomed to designate the collective sacrifices of the law. **With water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop.** These are

[1] 'Scarcely is in force,' μήποτε ἰσχύει, not the same, I think, as οὔποτε ἰσχύει, *never is in force*; but having the doubting, delicately *suggestive* import so common to the μή and μήποτε, *lest, whether, perchance*. The author thus elegantly puts the case, *ex gratiâ modestiæ*, not as admitting that the doctrine is really questionable, but preferring to hold back his own affirmation, and leave it to be supplied by his hearers. So in Longinus 'De Sublimitate,' ὄγκοι * * * μήποτε περιΐστανται ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὐναντίον "*the false sublime—perchance* (look whether not) *producing in us the opposite effect.*" Probably an elliptical construction, equivalent to ὅρα μήποτε ἰσχύει, *look whether it be in force.*

20 Saying, This *is* the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you.
21 Moreover he sprinkled likewise with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry.

20 the book itself, and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the [1]covenant which God commanded to
21 you-ward. Moreover the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry he sprinkled in like manner

1 The Greek word here used signifies both *covenant* and *testament*.

not mentioned in the above passage, but are found elsewhere in the Mosaic purifying lustrations, as Num. 19 : 6, 7; Lev. 14 : 2, seq., 49 seq., where they appear as employed in connection with purification from contact with a dead body, or from the leprosy. A mixture of living spring water, partly with the ashes of a red cow, partly with the blood of a slain bird, was in these cases prescribed. For this purpose hyssop was employed, wound with purple wool. The use of the water, and of the scarlet wool and hyssop as an instrument for sprinkling, needed perhaps no special voucher in the text; it was understood of itself. **And sprinkled both the book and all the people.** Exodus simply informs us that he sprinkled the people—substantially identical with 'all the people.' Nothing is said of the sprinkling of the book or scroll, which is of course the "book of the covenant," the scroll of papyrus or skin containing the record of the covenant. In introducing this, as also in the sprinkling of "the tabernacle and the vessels of the service," the author probably follows Jewish tradition.

20. Saying, This is the blood of the testament (*covenant*), **which God hath enjoined unto you.** The exact language of Exod. 24 : 8 is: "Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words." The slight changes are occasioned, partly perhaps by citing from memory, partly in half unconscious allusion to the corresponding language of the Saviour at the institution of the Sacred Supper: "This is my blood in the New Covenant," etc., which would seem to have an unquestionable reference to these words of Moses. The expression 'enjoined,' 'commanded' (ἐνετείλατο) is also substituted for 'made,' 'instituted' (διέθετο), in accordance with the frequent usage of the Septuagint.

21. Moreover he sprinkled, etc.—*And the tabernacle too and all the vessels of the service he sprinkled in like manner with the blood.* This refers to another and later occasion, as the tabernacle was not in existence when Moses thus solemnly inaugurated the covenant. It is brought into this connection for the sake of completeness, and of showing how extensively the use of blood marked the inauguration of the several parts of the Levitical worship. Of such a sprinkling, however, of the tabernacle when completed (see Exod. 40), the Mosaic account is silent. It informs us that the tabernacle was anointed with *oil*, and thus consecrated to the Lord, while Lev. 8 : 15, 19, 24, informs us of the sprinkling of the altar with blood, and Josephus ("Antiquities," 3 : 8, 6) informs us expressly that the garments of Aaron, the tabernacle, and its vessels, were all sprinkled with the blood of slaughtered victims. Such, therefore, was probably the Jewish tradition, in accordance with which is the language of our passage. On the literal exactness of every statement nothing specially depends. It would be enough that the author follows in the several particulars either the Mosaic narrative or accredited Jewish traditions. His language immediately following shows that the use of blood as an expiatory rite through almost all departments of the service was the point specially in his mind. This extensive use of blood in the Mosaic ritual had a deep significance. It marked not merely cleansing, purification; for that, *water* would have been the more natural symbol. It marked *expiation, atonement.* Before Jehovah could enter into covenant with his people, his displeasure must be either really or symbolically appeased. He could not allow them to come into relation with him as on terms of moral equality. He could not allow them to forget the interval between his holiness and their sinfulness; and thus blood must be shed, the life of the animal taken (for the life was in the blood), that by the life of the victim that of the people might be spared (Kurtz, "History of the Old Covenant," V. 3, p. 143.) The connection, then, was direct and close between the blood shed in inaugurating the Old, and that shed in inaugurating the New Covenant. The one *reminded* the

22 And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission.

22 with the blood. And according to the law, I may almost say, all things are cleansed with blood, and apart from shedding of blood there is no remission.

people of what was needed that God might be reconciled and enter into covenant relation with his people; the other *furnished* it. And for a similar reason the sanctuary and its utensils—nay, even the book of the covenant—must undergo a like sprinkling. Though consecrated to Jehovah, they had been wrought in their material parts by human hands; they had on them the contamination of sin. The very Holy of Holies, before God could dwell in it, must be cleansed from that stain of impurity and guilt which human hands had left upon it. It needed not only consecrating oil, but expiatory blood.

22. And almost all things, etc.—*And one might say, in blood are all things cleansed.* The original word, rendered 'almost' in the Common Version (σχεδόν, *one might say, about, pretty nearly*), is employed not like our *almost* (ὀλίγου δεῖν) to intimate that the statement is positively liable to some exception or abatement, but simply to qualify its absolute positiveness. It does not (like ὀλίγου δεῖν) commit the author to the fact that his statement is *not* unqualified, but simply refuses to commit him to the statement that it *is*. It is added regarding an assertion that may or *may not* be precisely accurate. It differs from "so to say" (ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, with which it in certain cases might be interchanged), in that the latter softens a statement in itself harsh or exaggerated; the other simply throws over the expression (in itself not necessarily in any way improbable) a slight shade of uncertainty.[1]

And without shedding of blood there is no remission. The name (αἱματεκχυσία) may denote either the *shedding* of the blood of the victim in sacrifice (so Bleek, Lünemann, Delitzsch), or the *pouring out* of the blood of the victim on the altar, and the sprinkling of it (so De Wette, Tholuck, Hofmann). The latter seems more in harmony with the immediate context, in which, not the shedding of the victim's blood, but its subsequent pouring forth, is spoken of, while the analogy of the language of Christ, who says at the Sacred Supper, "My blood, which is shed for you" (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον), as well as the general analogy of Christ's death, in that his blood was shed, but not afterward poured out, is urged by Delitzsch, on the other side. To this, however, it might be replied that our author himself speaks of the 'blood of sprinkling' (12:24), evidently referring to the blood of Christ under the Old Testament figure, and it may still, therefore, remain questionable which precise idea is intended. The essential meaning is, of course, the same in either. For the pouring out or sprinkling of the blood implies the previous shedding of it in the death of the victim as its necessary condition, while conversely under the Old Covenant the symbolical expiation was not completed until the subsequent sprinkling. Still the *death*, the taking the life, is in both cases the essential matter. What was symbolized, was that sin could not be expiated without death. Under the Old Testament formula, a legal remission stood connected with the ritual shedding of blood. *Real* remission was then, as always, through the atonement of Christ, which was thus symbolized.

23-28. Inference, now, from the earthly to the heavenly sanctuary; in other words, from the ceremonial and carnal to the purely spiritual Dispensation. As the former demanded the symbol, this demands the reality; as that the blood of animal sacrifices, this the blood of Christ; and his entrance *once for all* with a complete and final expiation, as High Priest, into the heavenly sanctuary.

[1] Thus Plato, "Phaedo," 2. Σχεδόν οὗτοι παρεγένοντο, "I should think that about these were present"—there may have been one or two others, and may not. It seems singular that Chrysostom, whom we must admit to have known his own language, refers σχεδόν to the verb, καθαρίζεται. It is less singular, though not less erroneous, that Bengel and Böhme refer it to ἐν αἵματι. Its proper and unquestionable reference is to 'all,' πάντα. The modifying shade of σχεδόν is not thrown on the verb, as if there were any doubt about the *cleansing;* not on 'in blood,' ἐν αἵματι, as if there were any doubt about its being in blood; but simply upon 'all,' πάντα, implying that the writer will not quite commit himself to the unqualified assertion that *everything* was cleansed with blood. '*In blood*'—that is, in the sphere of blood, equivalent to by or with blood.

23 *It was* therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.
24 For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, *which are* the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us:

23 It was necessary therefore that the copies of the things in the heavens should be cleansed with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.
24 For Christ entered not into a holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear before

23. It was (*is*)[1] therefore necessary that the patterns (*copies*) of (*the*) things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves [*be cleansed*] with better sacrifices than these. Resumption of the imagery drawn from the language: "See thou make all things after the pattern shown to thee in the mount." The earthly tabernacle is represented as a sort of shadowy representation of the greater and more perfect tabernacle, in which Christ, the great High Priest, ministers, and the objects grouped around it as having their archetypes in heaven. Thus, therefore, he continues in figurative language, as the earthly copies are cleansed with rites like these, their heavenly archetypes demand a nobler element of cleansing. But we need not be led astray by a figure, nor suppose for a moment that anything actually in heaven demands the cleansing of Christ's blood. The old tabernacle expressed relations: the old ritual was symbolical. Unable to accomplish any purification itself, it pointed forward to a purification to be accomplished by a Victim of infinite preciousness. While thus the symbolical purifications of the law are accomplished with sacrifices like these, the cleansings which they prefigure demand sacrifices far more costly and efficacious. A typical expiation may be made with the blood of bulls and goats; but a *real* expiation must be made with more precious blood; namely, that of Christ. The 'heavenly things' is especially the 'sanctuary,' and this perhaps would be better supplied. 'Sacrifices' in the plural, simply in analogy with the many Levitical sacrifices; not that here more than one is demanded.

24. For Christ is not entered, etc., *for not into a sanctuary made with hands*—and therefore not into one which could admit the carnal and outward purifications of that old material sanctuary, the earthly Holy of Holies—*did Christ enter.* The 'for' (γάρ), not (with Bleek, Lünemann) indicating the proof that Christ has really gone into the heavenly sanctuary; nor exactly (with Delitzsch) establishing the position that better sacrifices were demanded for the heavenly world from the fact of that one which has been actually offered, and then gone to God; but rather reasserting the reason why better sacrifices are demanded; namely, from the transcendent and spiritual character of the sanctuary into which Christ is gone, and the real, not the symbolical, presence of God into which he has entered.

Which are the figure, etc.—*the counterpart of the genuine one.* 'Counterpart' (ἀντίτυπος) is here clearly equivalent to *copy, shadowy representation* (ὑπόδειγμα, 8 : 5). Bleek, supposing the model (τύπος, 8 : 5) shown to Moses in the Mount to be itself a copy of the real, heavenly tabernacle, regards the 'counterpart' (ἀντίτυπος) here as a *copy of a copy.* Yet nothing could be more alien from the conception of the author. He does *not* regard that model shown to Moses as a copy, but it is expressly pointed to by him as the original of that constructed by Moses. Only we must rightly understand, and avoid unduly pressing, the figurative language of the author. Of course, he is merely using the model shown to Moses, issuing from the divine hand, as *standing for* the great moral and spiritual truths which the earthly tabernacle shadowed forth. That earthly tabernacle indicated *relations, facts, spiritual truths;* and these facts and truths it is exceedingly natural should, in figurative language, be gathered up and expressed in the pattern which came directly from the divine hand. If we take the material structure reared by Moses as symbolizing

[1] Delitzsch, Moll, etc., supply ἦν, there *was* necessity, making a temporal reference. With Lünemann and De Wette, I decidedly prefer ἐστίν, *is*, making the statement general and absolute. Had the author *intended* a past tense, he would have been much more likely to have expressed it. The *present* is easily understood of itself. Nor is the past required by the past (εἰσῆλθεν) of the following verse, for there the past tense is purely subordinate, the resolution of the clause being: "For it is into no sanctuary made with hands that Christ entered," etc.

25 Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others;

25 the face of God for us: nor yet that he should offer himself often; as the high priest entereth into the holy place year by year with blood not his own;

great truths, it is natural to put the model which God showed to him as answering to the truths themselves. It seems extraordinary that language so manifestly figurative, and really so obvious in its import, should have so puzzled and misled intelligent and acute minds. **But into heaven itself.** In the use of the word 'heaven,' the conception would naturally and easily vary. Sometimes Christ has passed *through* the heavens, and become higher than the heavens; at other times he is in the lofty heavens (so probably we are to supply 1 : 4), here 'in heaven itself.' In regard to a term so vague as that of 'heaven,' of course the language is not to be pressed. In reference to the lower, visible heavens, or even heaven as representing the highest part of the created universe, Christ has passed beyond and above the heavens. In another relation the heavens are themselves beyond the created universe, are the immediate dwelling place of God, conceived apart from conditions of space and time, and in such a sense the phrase is employed here. 'Heaven itself' is the heaven of heavens, the highest heaven, the seat of God's presence and glory, whether regarded locally or otherwise.

Now to appear, etc.—*be manifested before the face of God in behalf of us.* 'Now,' not as equivalent to continually, now and forevermore; but 'now,' *at last*, after so long a reign of shadow and copy and symbol, *Now* he is manifested before the face of God. He *now* accomplishes that actual drawing near, coming into the real presence of God, which the earthly high priest could do only in the most partial and imperfect manner. The earthly high priest entered the sanctuary amid a cloud of incense which half enveloped him and the mercy seat itself. He was half hidden from even the symbol of God. God appeared to him but in symbol, and even that symbol was but dimly visible. The awe-struck priest must have felt, under this near contact with Jehovah, as the collective Israelites felt at Sinai, and rejoiced perhaps that his entrance into that awful presence was at so wide intervals, and then so nearly vailed. But Christ has gone not into the symbolical, but the real and absolute presence of God. He is fully manifested before the fully manifested Deity. Father and Son, the Propitiated and the Propitiator, come into full communion, confronting, as it were, each other with open face. "Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."

25. Nor yet, etc.—*And not that he may frequently offer himself, as the high priest entereth into the holy place year by year with the blood of others.* Our author's use of offer (προσφέρειν) might allow its reference either to Christ's sacrificial offering of himself on earth (9 : 14, 28; 10 : 1, 2, etc.), or to his high priestly offering in heaven (8 : 3). Many interpreters (as Tholuck, De Wette, Ebrard, Lünemann) understand it of the former; others (as Hofmann, Delitzsch, Moll, Alford) of the latter. In favor of the latter is the immediately following comparison with the Jewish high priest, not as repeating his sacrifices, but as repeating his entrances into the sanctuary. The more exact verbal analogy, therefore, would refer the language to Christ's priestly offering on high. But this argument is by no means decisive, for in the author's mind (as in the actual fact) the two stand in inseparable connection. An entrance into the sanctuary supposes a preceding sacrifice; a sacrificial offering supposes the subsequent entrance. The spirit of the comparison, therefore (if not precisely its letter), is equally preserved by referring this "offering of himself" to Christ's previous sacrifice on earth. And as the added 'himself' seems to suggest rather the earthly than the heavenly offering, we may easily conceive that the author has, in this case, chosen the former as the representative act, and set over against the Levitical high priest's repeated entrances into the sanctuary (which involved repeated deaths), the hypothesis of Christ's repeated deaths (which involved repeated entrances into the heavenly sanctuary). And this idea of offering himself in death the language favors. It is natural to speak of 'offering himself' in death on the cross (as at ver. 14), and 'being offered,' which is close akin (ver. 28), but less so to speak of his 'offering himself' (whatever the precise import of the expression) in heaven. As we have thus warrant for the one and not for the other—for

26 For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.

26 else must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once at the [1] end of the ages hath he been manifested to put away sin [2] by

1 Or, *consummation*.... .2 Or, *by his sacrifice*.

what Christ is to offer as Heavenly Priest (8:3) is not 'himself,' but (9:3) 'his own blood'—I prefer, with most interpreters, this signification here. The ellipsis is easily supplied: "And [he has entered] not that he may frequently offer himself [in sacrifice, and thus frequently leave it and return to it], just as the high priest," etc. And in this interpretation we do not, I think, lay the author liable to De Wette's taunt of not being quite sure of his own meaning. We add that there is an implied argument in the contrast of Christ's offering *himself*, and the Levitical priests entering the sanctuary with *alien blood*.

26. For then, etc.—*since* [*then*] *he must have frequently suffered since the foundation of the world; but, as it is, once for all, at the end of the world, he has been manifested.*

The clause 'since the foundation of the world,' has by many former editors been enclosed in parentheses; but this is now generally, and rightly, expunged, and the clause taken in connection with the following. They thus present the two opposites of an alternative. In case that Christ had entered heaven, to offer himself repeatedly he must have frequently suffered since the foundation of the world; but in fact, as the case stands, he has *not* done so—he has manifested himself once for all in the consummation of the ages.

The passage is thus an *argument* against the supposition of this entrance for repeated offerings. But what kind of an argument? Is it from the intrinsic proprieties of the case, from the unnaturalness of Christ's having thus, many times in former ages, descended from heaven to suffer, and re-ascended for priestly mediation? If so, then why does the author dwell upon what must have been done in the past, rather than what this hypothesis would require in the future? Why not rather say that it would not be necessary that he should repeat his suffering many times in the ages to come? The only reply that can be made to this is that the world is conceived as having nearly run its appointed cycle, and there would be, in the future, no space left for such offerings.

The view above given is the ordinary one; but I cannot conceive it to be the just one, which seems to me much more simple and obvious. This is to take "*it was necessary*" (ἔδει), simply, of *logical necessity* (equivalent to "it could not but have been the case that") not of that which would have been required by the *fitness* of the case, but of that which would have actually happened, but which, as it is, *has not* happened. Had the priestly intercession of Christ, says the author, been like the services of the Levitical priests, requiring perpetual repetition, it would have involved, like theirs, repeated descents and sufferings on earth, and repeated re-ascensions and entrances into the heavenly sanctuary. No such thing has occurred; no such repetition of the victim's sufferings has been made—all has been deferred for one single, final, all-sufficient offering, both on earth and in heaven. This explanation, I think, is all sufficient. It accounts for the placing of this supposed repetition in the past and not in the future. Had Christ's priestly ministry, is the thought, been like the Levitical ministry, it would, like theirs, have demanded constant repetitions, and we should have witnessed the spectacle of a recurrence of his sufferings during the past ages. It relieves us, too, from another inquiry; namely, from answering the question, Why this repetition of the sufferings of Christ should not have actually occurred? Christ has actually descended from heaven and died once. Who is competent to assert that, granting the necessity, he should not have descended and died again? How can we be sure that the same exigency would not have led anew and repeatedly to the same sacrifice? Upon this and other like questions, we are not required to turn our minds. The author simply reminds us, as incontrovertible proof of the finality of this sacrifice, that the hypothesis of its non-efficiency and finality would have involved in the past ages its frequent repetition. *No such repetition has occurred.* As matter of fact, the whole mighty display of love and power has been reserved for and precipitated, as it

were, upon one decisive moment in the interlocking of the ages.

There is, indeed, another view, proposed by Hofmann (and followed by Delitzsch, Moll, and Alford), which may require a brief notice. It assumes that Christ's offering himself (ver. 25) refers to the priestly offering in heaven, not to his sacrificial offering on earth, and that the repetition of those heavenly self-presentations is denied on the ground that it would involve the necessity of his repeatedly suffering death on earth. But the peculiarity of the view lies in its denying that the author contemplates, along with these repeated heavenly oblations, correspondingly repeated descents and sufferings on earth. The author plants himself, this view maintains, on the heavenly entrance and priesthood of Christ as a finality. He does not once contemplate the withdrawal of Christ from the heavenly Holy of Holies, into which he has once entered, that he may re-descend and suffer, but only declares that, being there, he has not to make repeated offerings of himself, because this would involve the necessity that before he ascended there he should have gone through a series of sufferings corresponding to the number of his entrances into the heavenly sanctuary. This, they say, explains the reason of the limitation of his sufferings to past times. If he had now entered heaven to make *repeated* priestly oblations, then (as in the Levitical service there must be for every entrance into the sanctuary a separate sacrifice) he must, on earth in previous times, have undergone a corresponding number of deaths, and thus have suffered many times since the foundation of the world.

Ingenious as is this view, I think it is only the eminent ability of the men who have adopted and defended it that would require for it any serious notice. The explanation which we have adopted above is perfectly natural and simple, and makes equally clear the reference to the previous suffering. It is undoubtedly clear that the author plants himself on the singleness and finality of Christ's priestly entrance into the heavenly sanctuary; but why? Is it not because he conceives his single entrance into heaven as corresponding to one single, efficacious sacrifice on earth? And if the efficacy of that sacrifice is denied, would not the singleness and sufficiency of the heavenly presentation fall along with it? And why is it less easy to suppose Christ repeatedly dying, and making with each death a new priestly entrance into the Holy of Holies, than to suppose him first undergoing a series of deaths in successive ages, and then finally entering heaven to make a corresponding series of high-priestly oblations? This latter idea could never have suggested itself to a Jewish mind familiar with the Levitical sacrifices. The Levitical high priest entered, year by year, the Mosaic sanctuary; and with every successive entrance there was, of course, a fresh sacrifice. The idea of the Levitical priest entering repeatedly the inner tabernacle on the strength of a series of former sacrifices, would, it seems to me, have been simply monstrous. And not less monstrous is the supposition that Christ should, by a series of former deaths, have accumulated the material for a series of oblations after assuming the heavenly priesthood. One efficacious and final sacrifice followed by one final and permanent entrance, or a series of sacrifices followed by a series of entrances, is all that the analogy of the Levitical service could suggest. And surely the writer would not for a moment conceive of the absoluteness and finality of Christ's priestly offering, except as dependent on the absoluteness and finality of the previous sacrifice. Unfix the one, and you unfix the other; and then, according to the whole analogy of the Levitical priesthood, you make it necessary for him to descend and perform a new sacrifice. And the renewal of these ascents and descents is as supposable as the renewal of the deaths with which they are connected; and that these successive deaths should be supposed to have taken place after the analogy of the Jewish priestly rites, in connection with successive entrances into the sanctuary, is as easy as to suppose them to have taken place somewhere and somehow in former ages, and then their collective effect gathered up and made available in a succession of priestly offerings before God.

The only end gained by this hypothesis—namely, that it explains the phrase "Must have suffered many times from the foundation of the world"—is equally well gained by one which argues the sufficiency and finality of Christ's entrance and suffering, from the fact that he has not (as otherwise he would have)

27 And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment:
28 So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of

27 the sacrifice of himself. And inasmuch as it is [1] appointed unto men once to die, and after this *cometh*
28 judgment; so Christ also, having been once offered

1 Gr. *laid up for.*

suffered many times—and, of course, brought many priestly offerings—from the foundation of the world. As to his other argument, that the author ought otherwise to have said, "suffered and entered into the sanctuary," it is sufficient to say that the ellipsis is perfectly easily supplied (if requisite), every expiatory death supposing a subsequent entrance into the sanctuary with the blood, and every such entrance implying a previous expiatory sacrifice. Either, therefore, in this fixedness of their connection, may stand for both.

The 'consummation of the ages' (*συντέλεια αἰώνων*) is equivalent to, 'the end of these days'—that is, 'the end of the world,' or, 'the ages' (*τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων*), 1 Cor. 10:11, etc. It marks the point at which the pre-Messianic age terminates, and the coming, or 'future age' (*αἰὼν μέλλων*) commences. 'Manifested' here clearly not 'before God (as some) in the heavenly sanctuary,' but on earth in his incarnation. So 1 Tim. 3:16, "God was manifested in the flesh"; 1 John 1:2, "The life was manifested"; 1 Peter 1:20, "was manifested in the last times for you." Elsewhere the word is applied to Christ's second coming. (1 John 2:28.)

To put away sin, etc.—*For the doing away of sin by his sacrifice.* 'Doing away,' annulling, abrogation (*ἀθέτησις*), as of a law (7:18), of the sin, as well for past ages as for the generation in which he appeared. The expiation was good for all times, as shown by its being made at the close of the great historical eras. 'His sacrifice,' not, 'the sacrifice of himself' (*αὐτοῦ*), but 'the sacrifice which he offers,' which is indeed, of course, the sacrifice of himself, and need not be expressed.

27-28. A sort of argument from analogy for the single, unrepeated death of Christ. His case, says the author, stands in general relation to that of man, with whom he shares humanity, and to whose destiny his might be expected to bear a resemblance. In man's history there are two grand epochs: first, death; then, at a greater or less interval, a judgment. Each of them is for itself single and final. So there are two corresponding epochs in the history of Christ: first, his death to sin; then his coming to judgment. And as *one* death, once for all, is man's allotment until the final fixing of his destiny in the judgment, so *one* death for sin is Christ's allotment until his final coming to the judgment that shall fix the destiny of the world. The two epochs, then, in case of each, stand severally related to each other; their death once for all *through* sin to his death once for all *for* sin; and their appearing, as the next thing, at the tribunal of the final judgment, to his appearing as the next thing to rear and ascend that tribunal. There is thus, not merely the statement of a fact, but a sort of latent argument for the absolute finality, the decisive and abiding consequences of his atoning death.

27. And as it is appointed, etc.—*And in so far as it is reserved.* 'Reserved,' not exactly, as in the Common Version, 'appointed.' Also, not merely, as in our version, '*as*' (*ὡς*), or 'according as' (*καθώς*), but 'inasmuch as,' 'in so far as' (*καθ' ὅσον*), the words implying not merely a likeness, but a ground or reason. The author argues from the uniqueness of man's death and its relations to the next and great epoch in his destiny to a like uniqueness of Christ's death and a like relation to his Second Coming. **Once** (*for all*) **to die** (to die a death which has no repetition), **and after this the** (*a*) **judgment**—not necessarily immediately after. The reference is to the final judgment, and the interval may be greater or less. Nor does the 'judgment' here (as 10:2, 'a fearful looking for of judgment') necessarily imply condemnation. It is simply that adjudication which will take place for all men in righteousness (Acts 17:31), and of which the results, as stated in Matt. 25, will be eternal life or punishment, according to the characters of those judged.

28. So (*also*) **Christ,** etc. The latent ground of the inference here is Christ's participation in *humanity.* We may reason from men in general to him, because he also was *man* (*being*) *offered once for all.* Here clearly, 'offered upon the cross,' in expiatory sacrifice, the passive being used (not the active, 'offering himself') simply because the author would express the mere passive act of suffering,

many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.

to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for him, unto salvation.

without regard to the agent. Hence, we need neither, with Chrysostom, supply 'by himself,' nor 'by man or by God'; but may leave the thought in its absolute generality. **To bear the sins of many.** 'Many' here is used not as opposed to 'all,' and as limiting the extent of the purpose and applicability of the sacrifice. It is rather in contrast to the *single* dying; he died but *once*, but it was to bear the sins of *many*. A more disputed point is the precise meaning of 'bear' (ἀνενεγκεῖν). By many (with Chrysostom, Theophylact, etc.) it is understood of bringing the sins as a sacrifice to be immolated; by others (as Luther, Bleek, Hofmann, Lünemann), of 'taking away' (ἀφαιρεῖν) sins; by others (as Bengel) of carrying them to the cross; by others (as Böhme, De Wette, Delitzsch, Moll) of *substitionary* or vicarious bearing, of taking upon *himself* the sins of many. On the first and third of these meanings we need not dwell. Of the second, it is enough to say that it is more than doubtful whether the verb (ἀνενεγκεῖν) can be used in the sense of 'removing,' or 'taking away.'[1] It is more probable that, with allusion to Isa. 53 : 12, 'he bore (ἀνήνεγκε) the sins of many,' where, by comparison with 53 : 4, it clearly denotes substitutionary bearing—that is, *taking upon himself* (see also Matt. 8 : 17: he 'took (ἔλαβεν) our sins and bore (ἐβάστασεν) our diseases'), such is also the import of the word here, and that the author describes Christ as being offered in order to bear upon himself the burden of human sin, and thus take it away. **The** (*a*) **second time** (1 : 6) **without** (*apart from*) **sin**—not, without the contamination of sin, for that he never had; not, without temptation to sin, although this will be true; but here, in apparent contrast to 'bearing the sins of many,' he will come without the burden of sin upon him: that burden which made him a man of sorrows, which compelled him to endure temptation in the wilderness, agonize in the garden, and shed his blood on the cross. **Unto them that look for** (*await*) **him** (ἀπεκδεχομένοις, 1 Cor. 1 : 7; Phil. 3 : 20, and elsewhere in Paul)—to believers who, having trusted him, now while he is gone to God look anxiously and believingly for his reappearing. **Shall he appear** (ὀφθήσεται)—*will he be seen*. His coming will be visible, manifest to all. Acts 1 : 11, "will he come as ye *behold* him go up into heaven." See Matt. 24 : 27. **Unto** (*for*) **salvation.** Before, he came to render their salvation possible; now he will come to accomplish it. Before, he came to bear the burden of their sins; now he will come to bestow on them the blessed consequences of expiated and forgiven sin. Before, he appeared in sorrow and death, that they might live; now he will appear triumphant and glorious, that they may appear with him in glory.

Ch. 10. (5) *Summing up of the entire high priestly argument.* (10 : 1–18.)

Finality of the work of Christ, answering, perhaps, to the third point in the general thesis: First, after the order of Melchisedec; second, Christ becoming a High Priest; third, a High Priest forever.

Chapter 7 discusses Christ's priesthood after the order of Melchisedec. Chapters 8 and 9, his High Priesthood, as the antitype of Aaron, ministering, through his own blood, in the heavenly sanctuary, and by this office introducing a New Covenant. Chapter 10 : 1–18 may (with Delitzsch) be regarded as especially emphasizing the idea of 'forever.' It divides itself into three parts:

(*a*) Finality of Christ's voluntary *sacrifice* as opposed to the symbolical sacrifices of the law. (1–10.)

(*b*) Finality of Christ's priestly ministration, as opposed to the oft-repeated ministrations of the Levitical priesthood. (11–14.)

(*c*) Finality of the New Covenant, and of the sacrifice which seals it as effecting the absolute remission of sins. (15–18.)

—

(*a*) Finality of Christ's voluntary *sacrifice*, as opposed to the symbolical sacrifice of the law. (1–10.)

[1] That ἀναιρεῖν is so used furnishes no sufficient ground for affirming the same of ἀναφέρειν, the fundamental meaning of the two verbs (the one 'to raise, take up,' the other 'to bear') being so different.

CHAPTER X.

FOR the law having a shadow of good things to come, *and* not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect.
2 For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins.

1 For the law having a shadow of the good *things* to come, not the very image of the things, [1] can never with the same sacrifices year by year, which they offer continually, make perfect them that draw nigh.
2 Else would they not have ceased to be offered, because the worshippers, having been once cleansed,

1 Many ancient authorities read *they can.*

1. For the law having a shadow of the good things to come, *and* not the very image of the things. 'The law' is the Mosaic law, with its priestly institutions and rituals; not, of course, properly, the moral law (though that, in the mind of a Jew, was never sharply distinguished from the ceremonial), but more especially the ceremonial. The apostle, in Romans, generally has in view the law under its moral aspects; our author, in Hebrews, the law under its ritual aspects. The one regards it as requiring holiness; the other as symbolizing redemption. The one finds it impotent from the spirituality of its demands; the other from the carnality of its provisions. The "coming good things" are here, as at 9 : 11, not the blessings of the gospel regarded from the point of view of the law, but the blessings yet future to the believers—complete salvation, remission of sins, conformity and nearness to God. Of these blessings, the law had but the *shadow;* the gospel has their very *image.* In the law these great spiritual blessings are exhibited in mere symbol; it imparts nothing of their *substance.* The gospel, although not as yet giving them in their fullness and perfection, yet gives their substantial verity, gives their very image. The term 'image' is chosen designedly, because the contrast is not between the shadow of these things, contained in the law and the heavenly things themselves, but between their *shadow* as contained in the law, and their *image* as contained in the gospel. The relation of the Jewish ritual to the unseen and spiritual good things, is that of the shadow to the reality. The relation of the gospel sacrifice and expiation to them is that of an image which substantially embodies and represents, which gives their essential nature and glory, as 'speech is the image of thought'; as the Son is 'the image of the invisible God.' The law but represents these things in faint outlines: the gospel brings them home in a fruition which grasps their substantial blessedness, and in a hope which leaves them still 'good things to come.'

Year by year can never, etc.—*Never with the same sacrifices, year by year, which they offer perpetually.*

'Year by year' (κατ' ἐνιαυτόν), some (as Lünemann) connect with 'sacrifices,' the phrase thus equivalent to, 'with the same yearly sacrifices'; but with 'year by year' emphatically placed, Delitzsch gives it its most natural grammatical construction (but harsh as to the thought), 'year by year can never'—that is, can never as often as they are repeated. Others connect it, by a virtual transposition, with the verb 'offer'—'which they offer year by year.' It is difficult to decide between them, and the idea is substantially the same in all. 'They,' the subject of 'offer,' refers to the priests. 'Perpetually' (εἰς τὸ διηνεκές), not the absolute 'forever' (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα), but a qualified forever, *in perpetuum,* as 7 : 3, of Melchisedec's priesthood.

Make the comers, etc.—*Render perfect them that approach* to the sacrifices, or to God through them. They that 'approach' are the worshipers, not the priests. The 'perfecting' is cleansing spiritually the conscience, giving remission of sin and conscious reconciliation with God.

2. For then, etc. (*for otherwise*), **would they not have ceased to be offered?** Would not a single sacrifice have answered the purpose, the reality of expiation being secured? The interrogative construction is an emphatic form of affirmation. I may remark that, although the present tenses here (ver 1-11) seem to be based on the actual present existence of these sacrifices, yet the verb here employed—'would they not *have* ceased'—seems to throw doubt on this, if not to render it decidedly improbable. If the writer had distinctly in his mind the actual present time, one sees not why he should not have said,

3 But in those *sacrifices there is* a remembrance again *made* of sins every year.
4 For *it is* not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.
5 Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me:

3 would have had no more conscience of sins? But in those *sacrifices* there is a remembrance made of
4 sins year by year. For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins.
5 Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith,
Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not,
But a body didst thou prepare for me;

'would they not cease' (οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύοντο). I am inclined to the opinion that the use of the present tense, wherever employed here, has no express reference to the actual existence of the Jewish ritual, but simply follows the principle by which we conceive that which has existed for many ages as *always present*, and that the use of the present here neither proves nor disproves the existence of the ritual in the time of the writer.

Because that the worshippers, etc.—*Because that those who serve* (not the priest, but the private worshiper), *would have no longer a consciousness of sins, having once for all been cleansed.* Forgiveness, although it does not leave the believer without sin, leaves him henceforth in a state of pardon. The forgiveness of one sin is a guarantee for the forgiveness of all sins. Pardon is a *state*, and though the believer must come to the Advocate and Mediator with his fresh sins for the fresh application of the cleansing blood, yet, having received it once, he is certain of it ever after. The doctrine, therefore, here stated, holds without involving the consequences of instant sanctification.

3. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance (*a calling to mind*) **of sins year by year.** The Jewish sacrifices can accomplish, in the language of Philo, "not an oblivion of sins, but a calling them to remembrance." They quicken the conscience, but cannot lull it to repose. Their office is not to expiate, but to remind the soul of its need of expiation. Thus they really produce precisely the reverse effect to that for which they are resorted to. And this from the nature of the case:

4. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. The proposition needs no proof; the more naked the statement, the more palpable its truth. 'The blood of bulls and of goats,' which here represent any and all animals that may be offered in sacrifice, may suggest the need of an atoning death, but can do nothing more.

5-10. Proof from Ps. 40 : 7-9 that not animal sacrifices, but a conscious, voluntary, offering in obedience to the will of God, are acceptable to him. By virtue of this we are sanctified.

5. Wherefore (considering the utter inefficiency of all these sacrifices) **when he cometh into the world, he saith.** The author here introduces Christ as adopting the language of David (Ps. 40 : 7, seq.), uttered by him after his anointing; and when now, after many dangers and deliverances, he is in near prospect of the throne. On the final rending of the kingdom from Saul, in consequence of his disobedience, and its being given over to another, God says, through Samuel, to the unfaithful king (1 Sam. 15 : 22), "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." In the spirit of this language, the predestined child of royalty utters the words of the Psalm. As one escaped from hate and persecution, and passing through dangers and trials on his way to exaltation and triumph, and especially as the great ancestral type of Christ on his way to the throne, which was to find in Christ its true Occupant and its true stability and glory, the language may well be regarded as typical of his great Son and Successor, who, like himself, hunted by persecution, like himself, divinely rescued and guarded, also, like himself, though in an incomparably higher degree, recognized the insufficiency of animal sacrifices, and unconditionally devoted himself as the one acceptable sacrifice. The language, applied primarily to David, is applicable, typically, to Christ, and, indeed, is put directly into his mouth, as if the Psalmist were but the mere mouthpiece of the Messiah, as expressing the spirit and significance of his earthly mission, and as indicating the foreshadowing in the Old Testament of the grand, essential feature in the New. The author quotes somewhat freely (and apparently from memory) from the Septuagint, which again differs strikingly, though,

6 In burnt offerings and *sacrifices* for sin thou hast had no pleasure.
7 Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God.
8 Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and *offering* for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure *therein;* which are offered by the law;

6 In whole burnt offerings and *sacrifices* for sin thou hadst no pleasure:
7 Then said I, Lo, I am come
(In the roll of the book it is written of me)
To do thy will, O God.
8 Saying above, Sacrifices and offerings and whole burnt offerings and *sacrifices* for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein (the which are

after all, not essentially, from the original Hebrew. The Hebrew text runs literally thus:

Sacrifices and meat offerings thou desirest not,
Ears hast thou wrought (hollowed out, bored) for me;
Burnt offerings and sufferings thou demandest not,
Then said I; Lo I come
With the roll of the book which is written regarding me
(Or, In the roll of the book it is written regarding me),
I delight to do thy will, O God,
And thy law is in my heart.

The Septuagint, literally rendered, runs thus:

Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not,
But a body didst thou prepare for me;
Holocausts and sin offerings thou didst not require:
Then I said, Lo I come.
In the volume of the book it is written concerning me;
I desired to do thy will, O God,
And thy law in my inmost heart.

The deviations of the Septuagint from the original are less important than they at first seem. The most striking one substitutes 'a body didst thou prepare for me,' for, "ears didst thou hollow out (or open) for me." The meaning of both clauses is substantially the same, and probably the Greek translators, to avoid the harshness of a literal rendering, which, in Greek, would have been nearly unintelligible, simply generalized the expression, and instead of the more special symbol of obedience, 'the ears,' as the organs with which we hearken and obey, put the 'body' as the general instrument of accomplishing God's will; and thus represent God, instead of hollowing out for him ears with which he might hearken, as framing for him a body with which he might execute his will. That the Divine Spirit may have presided over the Septuagint translation, and made the language more expressly adapted to the work of David's Antitype, we cannot, perhaps, affirm, yet certainly not deny.

The other passage, 'In the volume of the book,' etc., admits of either rendering, and is rendered by Hengstenberg in accordance with the Septuagint. The "scroll of the book" is, of course, the book of the law, and especially Deuteronomy, which (Deut. 17:18, 19) was to be the inseparable *vade mecum* of the kings of Israel. 'With this law in my hands, which is written in regard to me'; or, 'In which rules are prescribed for me'; or, 'In the scroll of the law rules are prescribed for me,' or, 'It is written concerning me'—either of these may be the rendering of the original, and either would be perfectly suited to the mouth of David at this juncture of his life. Either, also, would be suited to the Messiah, although the former (given in the Septuagint) referring rather to a prophecy than a precept, seems, in his case, more eminently applicable. But it cannot be denied (with Delitzsch) that the whole passage bears a unique and almost mysterious character, which points it out as having a typical, and even prophetic, significance, especially when brought into comparison with some utterances of our Saviour which seem, in some sort, echoes of it, as John 8:29. 'Because I always do the things which are pleasing to him'; see 17:4. 'When coming into the world' may be understood, in a general way, not of any particular period, as his incarnation; still less, either of his entrance on his public ministry, or arriving at the age of manhood, or at the age of mature and clear perception regarding the nature of his mission. Rather, I think, it has reference to his pre-existence, and looks to the general spirit and purpose with which he submits to be clothed with flesh, and make his appearance among men.

I come to do thy will, O God, is an abbreviation, designed or undesigned, of the Septuagint, 'I come—I desire to do thy will, O God.' The alteration is in no way material, yet in its form, as expressing emphatic purpose, it applies with special appropriateness to the Messiah.

8. Recapitulation and inference. **Above when he said** (*when saying*), **Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither** (*nor*) **hadst pleasure in; which are offered by**

9 Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God.
He taketh away the first, that he may establish the
second.
10 By the which will we are sanctified through the
offering of the body of Jesus Christ once *for all*.
11 And every priest standeth daily ministering and
offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never
take away sins:

9 offered according to the law), then hath he said, Lo,
I am come to do thy will. He taketh away the first,
10 that he may establish the second. [1]By which will
we have been sanctified through the offering of the
11 body of Jesus Christ once for all. And every [2]priest
indeed standeth day by day ministering and offer-
ing oftentimes the same sacrifices, the which can

1 Or, *In*.....2 Some ancient authorities read *high priest*.

(*according to*) **the law.** The latter clause is the author's characterization of these various offerings, bringing them into relation to his purpose of showing the inadequacy of the law. 'Which' (αἵτινες) rather characterizes than individualizes the objects offered.

9. Then said he, etc.—*Then hath he said, Lo, I am come to do thy will.* **He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.** An inference from the whole passage, and a proof of his doctrine of the insufficiency of the Old Covenant sacrifices. Christ's obedience to God's gracious will is put in place of the sacrifices of the law. From this it follows that God's 'will' represents the deepest elements of his character. His 'will' stands as the expression of all those moral attributes of which the will is the executive exponent, and thus points to no merely arbitrary purpose or decision. Animal sacrifices are only superficial. Blind, involuntary, without moral nature, they can in no way touch the deeper springs of the divine character, nor truly propitiate it; there must be something that touches his essential spiritual attributes, that meets substantially the claims of his moral law. This the offering of Christ does. It is a spiritual holocaust, offered through an eternal spirit as against a perishable animal life, as a conscious, intelligent, voluntary sacrifice to the will of God. It consists in a perfect, unswerving obedience to the will of God, and finally in freely rendering up, in submission to that will, the body which God had prepared for him. The Son of God comes on the path of obedience. He learns obedience in the school of suffering, and submits, with a resignation which meets perfect approval, to the death from which, under the stress of sore temptation, he yet prays to be delivered. He becomes obedient unto death, even the death on the cross. The passage is interesting as intimating (as many others) the Father's agency in the work of redemption. It is not the merciful Son, placating the angry Father. it is God, so loving the world as to give his only begotten Son for its redemption, and the Son cheerfully concurring in and fully executing his allotted part. The 'will of God,' then, is the broader element which takes in the sacrifice of the Son as the mode of reaching its end.

10. By (*in*) **the which will**—in the sphere of which will; not that of Christ, but of God; this the higher and all encompassing element, under whose auspices, within whose ordering scope, the whole transaction takes place. **We are** (*have been*) **sanctified**—here referring not to internal, subjective, progressive sanctification, which gradually ripens the believer for heaven, but to the outward, formal, legal sanctification; the once for all setting apart, the consecrating, the instituting of the new and divine relation, out of which the sanctifying process (2 : 11, οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι) springs. **Through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.** 'The *body* of Jesus Christ' is inserted here with allusion to the clause, 'a body didst thou prepare for me.' It intimates that the Saviour carried out the purpose for which his body had been formed and given him, in offering it up a free-will sacrifice to God.

So much for the *first* part of this emphatic recapitulation — *the earthly offering.* The offerings of the law were animal, blind, involuntary on the part of the victims, having no inherent excellence or power; that of Christ was voluntary, spiritual, self-determined, an act of *obedience.* It is efficient, therefore, and final.

(*b*) Finality of Christ's priestly ministration as opposed to the oft repeated ministrations of the Levitical priesthood. (11–14.)

The high priestly self-presentation and offering of the royal and eternal Antitype of Melchisedec is in like manner as the offering of his body, final.

11. And every priest, etc.—*every priest indeed standeth ministering day by day, and offering frequently the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins.* The 'priest' here

12 But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God;
13 From henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool.
14 For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.
15 *Whereof* the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before,
16 This *is* the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them;
17 And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more.
18 Now where remission of these *is, there is* no more offering for sin.

12 never take away sins; but he, when he had offered one sacrifice for [1]sins for ever, sat down on the right
13 hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his
14 enemies be made the footstool of his feet. For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are
15 sanctified. And the Holy Spirit also beareth witness to us: for after he hath said,
16 This is the [2]covenant that [3]I will make with them
After those days, saith the Lord;
I will put my laws on their heart,
And upon their mind also will I write them;
then saith he,
17 And their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.
18 Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin.

1 Or, *sins, for ever sat down, etc*.....2 Or, *testament*.....3 Gr. *I will covenant.*

stands clearly for the 'high priest,' with whom Christ comes properly into comparison. 'Standeth'—in contrast with the royal Melchisedec Priest who 'took his seat' at the right hand of God. 'Which can never take away sins.' 'Which' (αἵτινες), as above, ver. 9, not merely enumerates, but *characterizes—of a kind which.* On this clause Delitzsch remarks: "The author does not mean to say that the sins for whose expiation the offerings were brought remained unforgiven to the worshiper, but that the offerings could produce no perfect peace of conscience, no assured certainty of a gracious state, no actual internal cleansing, and foundation of a new spiritual life." What I suppose the author means properly to say is, that the offerings themselves had no power to produce forgiveness of sin, or to work any new spiritual life. That all this might have existed, and in the case of all genuine worshipers really *did* exist, I suppose he would by no means deny. There was piety, there was true spiritual life, there was consciously forgiven sin under the Old Testament ritual. But it was not the product of that ritual. That symbolized salvation: it had the shadow of the good things to come; but it never *created* the first holy emotion, nor inspired the first breath of spiritual joy.

12. But this man, etc.—*He himself* (or emphatic *he*) *after offering one sacrifice for sins took his seat forever at the right hand of God.* A royal Priest, after the order of Melchisedec, with an untransferable priesthood.

13. From henceforth, etc—*henceforth awaiting till his enemies be made his footstool.* According to the promise made him at his exaltation, Ps. 110:1: "Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." (Matt. 22:44; 1 Cor. 15:25.)

14. For by (*with*) **one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified**—and therefore needs not renew that offering, as the victims slain under the law, which could bring no perfection, and required constant renewal.

(*c*) Finality of the New Covenant, of the sacrifice which seals it as effecting the absolute remission of sins. (15–18.)

And finally, to all this the Holy Spirit sets his seal by declaring that under the New Covenant, ratified by the blood of Christ, a work of inward regeneration is wrought, and the sins of the believer are effaced from his consciousness forever, and thus sets aside all possible need of any further offering.

15-17. The Holy Ghost (*Spirit*) **also is a** (*beareth*) **witness to us.** The Holy Spirit, as the special Inspirer of Scripture, and thus, so to speak, responsible for all which Scripture contains, and giving to it his sanction, is referred to by the author, 3:7. See also 9:8. **For after that he had said** (*having said*), **This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord**—*giving my laws on their hearts, and upon their mind also I will write them, and their sins and their iniquities I will remember no more.* The point of the quotation lies in ver. 17. Yet the others are also important as showing that true and proper forgiveness stands only in connection with a system which can reach and renovate the spiritual nature. We have now the final inference.

18. Now where remission of these is, there is no more (*no longer*) **offering for sin.** Whether 'no longer' (οὐκέτι) be taken here as logical or temporal (either, equally accordant with Greek usage), it matters little; the conclusion is the same. The complete,

unconditional forgiveness of sin renders unnecessary any further expiatory sacrifice, and the system which actually imparts that must supersede forever the system which could only point to it.

With this triple reiteration of the *forever*—the absoluteness and finality of the work of Christ closes this brief, but striking epilogue. Let us again glance back over it. That work is final.

First. In substituting a free, voluntary, obedient sacrifice of the body of Christ, in place of the animal sacrifices of the law.

Second. In substituting the royal, untransferable Melchisedec high priesthood of Christ, with its single high-priestly oblation, for the ineffectual and therefore oft-repeated ministrations in the sanctuary of the Levitical priests.

Third. In introducing a new, spiritual *covenant*, which engraves its record on the heart, and in effacing the guilt of the conscience renders further offering unnecessary.

In each of these divisions our ear catches the echo of that 'forever' (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα), which at 6 : 20 forms the closing topic of his grand thesis: 'AFTER THE ORDER OF MELCHISEDEC'—'A HIGH PRIEST'—'FOREVER.'

The argument is completed. The three grand sections of the discussion proper are closed. Jesus, the Apostle of a New Covenant, greater than the angels, the messengers and ministers of the Old; Jesus, the Founder of the New Testament house of God, the spiritual Israel, greater than Moses, the founder and lawgiver of the household of ancient Israel; and finally and especially—for this was the grand topic to which the author was hastening, and all that precedes was but subordinate and introductory—Jesus, the great High Priest of the New Covenant, comprising in his own person the regal and eternal dignity symbolized in Melchisedec, and the power really to expiate, forgive, and bring near to God, symbolized in Aaron—all these topics have passed successively before us, and each has been touched briefly, grandly, weightily, as befitted the weighty theme.

But the author's aim was practical, not theoretical. This sublime discussion, like all other portions of Scripture, had its origin in immediate spiritual necessities. Its purpose was to re-establish the waning faith of converts from Judaism, who were in imminent danger of lapsing back to their old worship and apostatizing from the living God. With a view to this, he has already thrice broken the thread of the discussion, in order to give to his doctrine a most impressive, practical turn, and now, the argument proper being completed, the whole remainder of the Epistle assumes a hortatory character, and that, too, never for a moment forgetting the one leading purpose of warning its readers against apostasy. Until its very last chapter, it never so far loses sight of this as to turn to those general exhortations which belong to the Christian life. The key-note struck at the beginning is, with a marvelous concentration and intensity of purpose, carried through to the end. With the skill, too, which marks its general structure, the author so manages as to take up the thread of exhortation here precisely where he had dropped it at 4 : 16, where he first formally entered on the subject of Christ's priesthood. There the injunction is: 'Let us approach with boldness to the throne of grace'; here, 'Having therefore boldness, let us approach with a true heart,' in full assurance of faith.

PART II. HORTATORY.

Exhortation to the readers, in view of their having such a High Priest, and access to the heavenly throne, to draw near with boldness and maintain their fidelity to their Christian profession; and this enforced by the terrible consequences of apostasy, and by an appeal to them to secure by steadfastness, until the now near end, the fruits of their former sufferings and fidelity. (19–39.)

(*a*) Exhortation to approach God boldly by the new and living way into the sanctuary opened in Christ, to stir up each other in love, and not forsake the Christian assemblies. (19–25)

(*b*) Enforcement of this exhortation by setting forth (as at 6 : 3–8) the fearful consequences of apostasy. (26–31.)

(*c*) The author reminds them encouragingly of their former sacrifices for Christ, and urges them not to lose the reward of their labors, but to endure with faith and patience during the brief interval until the Second Coming. (32–39.)

19 Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus,
20 By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the vail, that is to say, his flesh;
21 And *having* a high priest over the house of God;

19 Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into
20 the holy place by the blood of Jesus, by the way which he dedicated for us, a new and living way,
21 through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and *hav-*

Another of the numerous triplets into which the divisions of this Epistle naturally falls.

(*a*) Exhortation to approach God boldly, to stir up each other to love, and not to forsake the Christian assemblies. (19–25.)

19. Having therefore, brethren, boldness, etc.—*for the entering into;* literally, 'for the entrance of the sanctuary'—that is, the heavenly Holy of Holies, figurative for the immediate presence and communion of God. **By (*in*) the blood of Jesus.** The connection of this clause is variously given. By many (with Bleek), "an *entrance* in or by the blood of Jesus," to which Delitzsch objects that entering in or with blood is strictly a high-priestly act. But *is* not the believer's entrance into the sanctuary conceived as strictly in or by the blood of Jesus? Jesus goes in by his own blood, but as Forerunner, leading his people after him, who thus enter in or by his blood. By Delitzsch the construction is given, '*boldness*, or confidence in the blood of Jesus'; 'boldness or confidence,' that is, which rests on the sacrifice of Jesus. By others, as Lünemann, it is connected with the previous clause as a whole: 'having boldness for the entrance . . . in the blood of Jesus.' Perhaps there is not much choice in the constructions. In either case the "blood of Jesus," shed in sacrifice on the cross, and figuratively borne into the heavenly Holy of Holies, there to be sprinkled on the mercy seat, is the efficient means of realizing that approach to God which the blood of Old Testament victims only symbolized.

20. By a new and living way, etc.—*Which he dedicated for us, as a new and living way.* 'Which' (*entrance*, εἴσοδος) is described as 'new,' because hitherto unopened and unknown; 'living,' not because it leads to life, not as equivalent to life-giving, but in contrast with the natural and lifeless 'way' of stone, that led the high priest into the earthly sanctuary; a living, spiritual path, which brings to the true heavenly goal. This entrance Christ dedicated by himself passing over it. **Through the vail, that is to say, his flesh.** The flesh or body of Christ is compared to the vail which hung before the earthly Holy of Holies, because as long as his body remained uncrucified, an entrance into that sanctuary was impossible, In the crucifixion the body of Christ and the vail of the sanctuary were rent simultaneously. The figure, however, is here merely accidental. We are not to suppose that the author regarded the vail of the tabernacle as symbolizing properly the body of Christ. It is only so conceived for the moment, with perhaps an allusion to the 'living way' that took its place. The vail partakes of that character of life. The vail of the old tabernacle was dead matter; the living (though dead) body of Christ takes its place.

But shall we construct the 'through' (διά) with the 'way' (*locally*, "through the vail," as Bleek, De Wette, Lünemann, Kurtz), or with 'dedicated,' taking it *instrumentally* "by means of" (as Delitzsch, who says that the idea is not that *for us* the way leads through the vail, since this was done away by Christ)? Though this is true, yet as the means by which Christ entered the Holy of Holies was his own broken body, and he entered as the Foreruuner of his people, and it is not unnatural to conceive that through which we pass instrumentally as also that through which we pass locally, I think the local construction with 'way' (ὁδόν) more natural.[1]

21. And having a (*great*) **priest over the house of God.** Our first ground of encouragement for drawing near to God is that our great Forerunner has passed through the vail and opened a path by which we may follow him, so that the vail no longer exists, except rather as a means of, than an exclusion from, entrance. Our second is, that in that awful sanctuary, that house of God, we have a Great Priest to make intercession for us, and shield our weakness under the blaze of the Divine Majesty. 'Great Priest' is not here a synonym for 'High Priest,' but rather designates Christ as exalted in kingly and priestly majesty. The 'house of God' seems here to be the heavenly house, the abode of God, and

[1] With the verb we should have expected an added εἰσελθών.

22 Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.
23 Let us hold fast the profession of *our* faith without wavering; for he *is* faithful that promised;

22 *ing* a great priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in [1]fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil [2]conscience:
23 and having our body washed with pure water, let us hold fast the confession of our hope that it waver

1 Or, *full assurance*.....2 Or, *conscience, and our body washed with pure water: let us hold fast.*

the predestined dwelling place of his children. The 'house of God' (3:2) was God's house on earth (and, perhaps, also in heaven), the organized community of his people the New Testament 'house of Israel.' Here, it is rather that 'house of my Father in which are many mansions,' where God dwells, and where Jesus has gone to prepare a place for his disciples.

22. Let us draw near—that is, to God, to the heavenly sanctuary—**with a true heart**—with a real, genuine heart (ἀληθινῆς), a heart that answers to the name; hence, not false, not hypocritical—**in full assurance of faith.** At 6:11 he exhorts the readers to strive after the 'full assurance (πληροφορία) of hope'; here, with very similar idea, to come in 'the full assurance of faith.' Hope looks forward to the end; faith lays hold of the means. Hope fastens on the anticipated glories; faith on him and his work, by whom they are to be realized. By faith we dismiss all doubts of our right to enter the path previously trod by the Redeemer, and of the efficacy of his atonement and intercession.

Having (*had*) **our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience.** This clause, I think, stands immediately, and most naturally, connected with the preceding. It completes the statement of the subjective moral conditions under which we can draw near to God, and assigns the ground on which we may have the 'true heart' and the 'full assurance of faith'; namely, that our hearts have been sprinkled from an evil conscience. Until the 'blood of sprinkling,' instead of being sprinkled over our bodies, falls upon our *hearts*, and cleanses away the sense of guilt, replacing it with conscious reconciliation, pardon, and spiritual peace, there can be no 'true heart,' no real confidence of faith. As then the people of the Old Covenant were sprinkled outwardly by Moses with the blood of the unconscious victims, so let us come with boldness, having had *our hearts* sprinkled with the blood of him who, through an eternal spirit, offered himself to God. This participial clause (as also the following), is not a part of the exhortation, but is the *basis* of the exhortation. These clauses express the ideal condition of the believers. He *has had* his heart sprinkled from an evil conscience, and his body washed in pure water. These are the conditions of his entrance on the Christian life. The sprinkling of the heart from an evil conscience is the distinguishing feature of the gospel—it is the primary gift of Christ; and, as *having had* this sprinkling, and the subsequent and corresponding external washing of baptism, the disciples are exhorted to all Christian confidence and fidelity.

23. And **having** (*had*) **our bodies washed with pure water, let us hold fast** (*maintain*) **the** *confession of our hope unwavering*). Calvin and some others have found in this first clause a reference (Ezek. 36:25) to the outpouring of the Spirit; but such a reference is forbidden alike by the use of the term 'body,' showing a material application of water, and the connection of the passage. The purifying rites of the Old Covenant were partly with blood and partly with water. *Expiation* was symbolized by blood—simple *cleansing*, and moral purity, by water. The New Covenant meets the Old at every point. For the sprinkling of the blood of beasts upon the body it has the sprinkling of the blood of Christ upon the heart. For the lustrations with water, by which the priests cleansed themselves when entering on their duties, and especially for that complete bathing of the body which the high priest underwent before entering the inner sanctuary (Lev. 16:4), the Christian priesthood, before following Christ within the vail into the presence of God, must also submit to the same symbolical cleansing, though vastly more significant. This is clearly baptism—"not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God." Thus the author unites the outward and the inward; the efficient and the sacramental elements of the Christian life; deliverance from the guilt and power of sin wrought by the Holy Spirit on

24 And let us consider one another to provoke unto
love and to good works:
25 Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together,
as the manner of some *is;* but exhorting *one another*:
and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching.

24 not; for he is faithful who promised: and let us con-
sider one another to provoke unto love and good
25 works; not forsaking our own assembling together,
as the custom of some is, but exhorting *one another;*
and so much the more, as ye see the day drawing
nigh.

the application of the blood of Christ to the soul, and then this moral renovation and purity—a death to sin and a resurrection to holiness—symbolized in the bath of baptism. As the preceding clause naturally connects itself with what goes before, so this connects itself with what succeeds—with baptism associates itself 'confession' (ὁμολογία), an acknowledgment of devotion to Christ. Only by thus separating the clauses do we avoid a very abrupt transition. *Unwavering, unbending*, is the predicative qualification of 'confession.' Let us hold our confession unbending, so that it shall not waver. The author proceeds to assign a reason: **For faithful is he that promised.** God, who made the promise, is faithful and true (1 Thess. 5:24; 1 Cor. 1:9), "he gives by covenant and by oath" (6:13-18); and by both, alike, it is impossible for him to deceive.

24. Verse 22 exhorts believers to come in full confidence of *faith;* verse 23 to hold unwavering the confession of *hope;* the present verse completes the triad of Christian graces. **And let us consider one another to provoke** (*stir up*) **unto love and to good works.** The idea is not (as the original might be possibly construed), 'let us contemplate one another, for the purpose of finding in our common example a stimulus to love and good works,' but, 'let us give heed to one another, that we may stimulate one another,' etc. As Christian brethren, members of the same great household, having access to the same heavenly sanctuary, and fellow-worshipers, let us regard one another's interests, and each strive for the good of all.

25. Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together—the gathering together for Christian communion and worship. This, of course, does not mean not abandoning altogether the Christian assemblies, which, of course, would be a token of final apostasy, and to which the language, 'as the manner of some is,' would be inapplicable; but that failure, frequently and statedly, to gather themselves in Christian assemblages, whether from indifference or fear or doubt, which would endanger their Christian steadfastness, and certainly check their spiritual growth. **As the manner of some is.** Some had already given this token of indifference and half-heartedness in the Christian profession, and thus laid themselves liable to just rebuke. The language does not mark formal apostates, but those who might be on the road to apostasy. **But exhorting one another**—as, by clear implication, they could do most effectually in their assemblies, where they could be fired by a common zeal. **And** (*by*) **so much the more, as ye see the day approaching** (*drawing nigh*). 'The day' is the day of Christ, the day of the Lord's return, which, according to his prediction, was supposed to be near, which, in fact, *was* near, and of which the tokens were already visible. That, according to the whole scheme of Hebrew prophecy, our Lord puts his symbolical and anticipatory coming in the breaking up of the Jewish state, and the final extinction of the old theocratic system, in place of that final and greater coming, which the former but foreshadowed, and that, according to this principle, we are to interpret the numerous New Testament prophecies on this point, seems well nigh certain. Two things are clear: First, that our Lord repeatedly gave his disciples to understand that his return was to be speedy and before the passing away of that generation, and that, accordingly, such an expectation existed in the church; secondly, that, in fact, this coming was only figurative, while that for which it stood—the *Parousia*, in its absolute sense—was far in the future, and was known to be so by the Spirit that presided over the whole scheme of prophecy. Indications of the coming day of wrath about to break over devoted Jerusalem were doubtless already visible. The emphasis lies not on 'day' or 'approaching,' but on 'see.' It is by how much his readers *see* the day of the Lord approaching, by how much its lurid light is already breaking along the horizon of the future, that they are exhorted to fidelity.

(*b*) The exhortation sharpened by the terrible consequences of apostasy. (26–31.)

26 For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins,
27 But a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.

26 For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no
27 more a sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful expectation of judgment, and a [1] fierceness of fire which

1 Or, *jealousy.*

26. For if we sin wilfully (*voluntarily*). The sin is clearly that of apostasy—that is, as denoted by the present participle (ἁμαρτανόντων), that *abiding* in sin, that yielding ourselves permanently to its power, which marks an evil heart of settled unbelief. And the sin itself is not so much sinful indulgences, which spring up in consequence of departing from God, as those internal acts which constitute that departure itself. It is not sin, in its incidental effects, in its blossoms, that is struck at; but sin, in its essential nature, and in its deepest root; unbelief, with its natural concomitants. Similarly John uses the term (1:39), "Every one that is begotten of God does not commit sin; because his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin because he is begotten of God." To 'sin voluntarily' or 'wilfully,' then, is voluntarily to renounce the faith which we have reposed in Christ, and make a formal return to the beggarly elements which we had abandoned. **After we have received** (*receiving*) **the knowledge of the truth**—after being 'enlightened' and 'tasting the good word of God.' 'Knowledge' (ἐπίγνωσις), here equivalent to 'recognition,' 'acknowledgment,' not merely a passive illumination (γνῶσις), but one which had been accompanied by a positive movement, and a full and ratifying assent of the mind; thus a stronger and more emphatic word than the latter (γνῶσις).

On the question whether this marks a true child of God, and, if so, whether it is possible for him actually so to sin, see the remarks at 6:3–5. I would here simply repeat: (1) There is not, in all the Epistle, I think, a positive declaration that the persons in question do fall away. The only thing positively stated is the desperate *consequence* of such falling, in case it may happen. The power of divine grace has been exhausted, and the case, therefore, is hopeless. (2) There are repeated statements made throughout the New Testament that the truly regenerated cannot fall away. Such, among others, is the passage (1 John 3:9) quoted above; such John 10:28, 29; Rom. 8:35–39. It is difficult to see how passages like these could be written, if it were a fact that many who had been regenerated by the grace of God, did actually fall again under the final power of the devil. (3) In the whole New Testament, apostasy is regarded as *subjectively* possible. The apostle, who probably had no doubt of his final salvation, yet says, "I keep my body under, lest after preaching to others I myself prove reprobate." And so every where he treats the perseverance and final salvation of believers as resting instrumentally on their efforts; and, subjectively, they are always in danger of falling away. The Epistle to the Hebrews only puts this general doctrine, which pervades the entire New Testament, in a stronger and more solemn light, by how much the case was more pressing, and the danger more imminent. But neither here nor elsewhere is there an explicit declaration of the possibility of that falling away of believers, which, if admitted, revolutionizes the New Testament doctrine of salvation, and goes far to take away the sacredness and divinity of a heavenly birth.

There remaineth no more (*a*) **sacrifice for sins.** Either, there will be no repeated offering for sin; Christ will not die again; or, the benefits of that offering which has been made will be no longer available to them. So far as the language may refer to the objectively impossible falling away of true believers, it is the former; so far as to the lapse of the highly enlightened, but not really regenerate, it is the latter. If Christians fall away, the entire resources of salvation are exhausted; the blood of Christ has proved its utmost power and been inefficacious. If others fall away who have reached a very high grade of spiritual enlightenment, who have experienced all of divine influence *but* regeneration, their recovery is morally impossible. God will not bless the efforts for their renewal, but, like the field that has answered the rains and sunshine only with thorns and thistles, will give them over to the burning.

27. The last verse gave the negative side of their punishment; the present gives its positive. **But** (*there remaineth*) **a certain**

28 He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses:
29 Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?

28 shall devour the adversaries. A man that hath set at nought Moses' law dieth without compassion on
29 *the word of* two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, think ye, shall he be judged worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, [1]an unholy thing, and

1 Gr. *a common thing.*

fearful looking for of judgment. By an elegant metaphor the epithet 'fearful' is transferred from the 'judgment' to the expectation of it, the nature of the judgment being thus inferable from that of the foreboding of it. 'Judgment' (κρίσις) is here, as occasionally elsewhere, equivalent to condemnation (κατάκρισις), 'a certain' (τις), giving a certain vagueness to the representation, and implying it as indescribable, heightens its fearful character. **And fiery indignation** (*a wrath of fire*), **which shall** (*is about to*) **devour the adversaries.** The two clauses give the entire elements of their condition. Their present allotment is an inward, fearful anticipation of vengeance; their future is an outward 'wrath of fire' that will devour them at the final judgment which they shudderingly anticipate. 'Wrath of fire' (πυρὸς ζῆλος), not 'fiery indignation,' as in the Common Version. The fire itself in which that day shall be revealed (1 Cor. 3 : 13, "For the day shall disclose it because it is revealed in fire"), is personified and represented as putting forth its wrath. 'About to' (μέλλοντος) refers to the *speediness* of the coming wrath. They could *see* the day approaching in which Christ would come to be glorified in his saints, and to take vengeance on his enemies. It is not always near in precisely the sense in which it was then; for then, in awful symbol, it *was* just at hand; but it is always near to the eye of faith which reckons that "the Lord is not slack concerning his promise as men count slackness." The language clearly alludes to Isa. 26 : 11; Septuagint, 26 : 11 : "Wrath (ζῆλος) shall seize an ignorant people, and now fire will devour the adversaries" (πῦρ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους ἔδεται).

28. An emphatic repetition of the sentiment expressed in 2 : 2, 3, and of the *sentiment* (though more indirectly expressed) of 3 : 7–19. What is stated hypothetically (though not doubtingly) in chapter 2 is here stated positively. **He that despised** (*any one setting at nought;* ἀθετήσας, doing away with, annulling, abrogating, so far as in his power; see ἀθέτησις, 7 : 18) **the law of Moses died without mercy** (*compassion*) **under two or three witnesses.** Many minor violations of the Mosaic law were punished with death; but the special reference here seems (as is natural) to cases of blasphemy (Lev. 24 : 11-16), idolatry, and instigation thereto (Deut. 17 : 2-7), especially, perhaps, the latter, as here the condition of two or three witnesses is especially prescribed. This falling away from Jehovah was more than a mere ordinary transgression. It was a virtual annulling (ἀθέτησις) of that law; a renunciation of its authority, and thus stands in a like category to falling away from Christ. The argument proceeds from the less to the greater.

29. Of how much sorer punishment, suppose (*think*) **ye, shall he be thought worthy.** In this 'think ye' the author leaves the case to the judgment and conscience of his hearers. They, in view of the relative degrees of guilt, may decide for themselves on the relative degrees of punishment in the two cases. 'Deemed worthy'—namely, by God in the final judgment. As there can be no worse earthly punishment than death, that here spoken of must of course be after death. **Who hath trodden under foot the Son of God.** 'Trod down,' 'trampled' (καταπατεῖν, as Matt. 6 : 9, "they will trample them under their feet"), the strongest expression of contempt and act of insult. Of course, it is not intended to affirm that these apostates treat with wanton contempt and contumely the Saviour whom they abandon, but that they virtually do so; such is a fair interpretation of their act of desertion. In turning their backs on Christ they, as it were, deny and crucify him afresh, and ratify the rejection of him by their fathers. This is written, we must remember, to those whose fathers and nation had but recently, with reviling and blasphemy, rejected the Messiah. **And hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith** (*in which*) **he was sanctified, an unholy thing** (*impure*). The blood of

30 For we know him that hath said, Vengeance *belongeth* unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge his people.
31 *It is* a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.

30 hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? For we know him who said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense. And again, The Lord shall judge
31 his people. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.

Christ shed in ratification of the New Covenant is the blood of the Covenant. *In* this blood—in its sphere, through it, by it—the believer had been sanctified, had been made *holy* (ἅγιος), here referring not so much to that process of personal sanctification, which each believer inwardly undergoes, as to the formal outward relation of saints, holy or consecrated ones, into which all are brought by virtue of their faith in Christ. The blood of Christ, by which this sacred cleansing has been wrought, the apostate from him thus decides to be unclean; whether *impure* as opposed to *pure* (as Tholuck, Ebrard, Lünemann, etc.), or *common* as opposed to *sacred* (as De Wette, Delitzsch), it is difficult to decide. Perhaps both conceptions are substantially included in it. **Hath done despite unto** (*outraged, treated contumeliously*) **the Spirit of grace.** All gracious influences which had wrought upon him were the product of the Spirit. It was the Spirit that had *enlightened* him (John 16 : 13, "he shall lead you into all truth"), that had *quickened* him, that had applied to him the sanctifying efficacy of the blood of Christ. As all spiritual life is the product of the Spirit, religious apostasy, as it is a trampling on the blood of Christ as its formal and legal author, so is heaping contumely on the work of the Spirit, as its efficient, internal author. The one is not intended to mark the unpardonable sin, or the sin against the Holy Ghost, more than the other. Both are different aspects of the same act. The Spirit of grace is either the Spirit, as the *gift of grace* (as Bleek, De Wette, Lünemann), or, better (with Böhme, Delitzsch, Moll), as the *efficient principle* of grace.

30. For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge his people. These citations indicate the punishment which may be expected to fall upon these willful transgressors. God is not only a God of grace, but a God of judgment. 'We know him that hath said' is at once an elegant and an emphatic mode of saying, "We know what is implied in the language of him who says," etc. It points to our knowledge of the rectitude and truthfulness of him who makes the utterance. The citations are, the first from Deut. 32 : 35, the second from Deut. 32 : 36, repeated in Ps. 135 : 14. The first deviates in form alike from the Hebrew original ("vengeance is mine and recompense"), and still more from the Septuagint ("In the day of vengeance I will recompense"), but accords with the form of quotation in Rom. 12 : 19. Whether influenced in its form by that of Romans, or both founded on some current and familiar mode of expressing the sentiment, is doubtful. Nor does it matter, as the thought is unaffected. In the former passage there is in the original a direct declaration of God's judicial severity in dealing with his enemies, and it is obviously and directly in point. In the second, there is a seeming discrepancy between the original import of the passage and the use to which the author applies it. But it is only seeming. The Lord will judge his people by interposing mercifully in their behalf. But this merciful interposition in their favor involves the infliction of vengeance on their enemies. The judgment of God *for* Israel in Egypt was a judgment *upon* and *against* the Egyptians.

31. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God. This closes and puts the seal on this terrible passage of warning. It is the sentiment which spontaneously rises to the mind in view of the crime and him against whom it is committed. The willful transgressor throws himself into the hands of an avenging God. David, when offered a choice between punishments, chose pestilence rather than war, on the ground that it was better to fall into the hands of God than of man. David's choice was made in faith, but even so he found this alternative sufficiently terrible. God's chastising and correcting judgments are fearful; how much more then his punitive! If he scourges so severely those whom he will save, how much more those whom he will destroy! If the cup of mercy is often mingled with so bitter ingredients, how when "the wine of his wrath is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation!"

32 But call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were illuminated, ye endured a great fight of afflictions;
33 Partly, whilst ye were made a gazing-stock both by reproaches and afflictions; and partly, whilst ye became companions of them that were so used.
34 For ye had compassion of me in my bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance.

32 But call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were enlightened, ye endured a great
33 conflict of sufferings; partly, being made a gazing-stock both by reproaches and afflictions; and partly, becoming partakers with them that were so used.
34 For ye both had compassion on them that were in bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your possessions, knowing [1] that ye have for yourselves a better

1 Many ancient authorities read *that ye have your own selves for a, etc.*

(*c*) Encouragement from past fidelity, and exhortation not to throw away its fruits. (32–39.)

The author, as before in chapter 6, follows his awful threat (4:8) by words of encouragement, so here again 'changes his voice' (Gal. 4:20), and presents considerations of a more cheering character. He will not overwhelm, but alarm. He will not drive them to despair, but stir up by all possible means any smoldering embers of spiritual life. He turns to the brighter side of the picture.

32. But call to remembrance the former days, in which, after *being* **illuminated, ye endured a great fight of afflictions** (*a conflict of sufferings*). Whether 'illuminated' here refers to their being enlightened as to the deficiencies of Judaism and the nature of Christianity, or, as elsewhere, is simply a term for coming to the knowledge of Christ, spiritual enlightenment in general, is perhaps doubtful. I think it is the latter. The language here, as noticed by Chrysostom, is the carefully chosen language of commendation. They 'endured' (ὑπομένειν), implying resolution and firmness. They endured not trials or temptations, but a struggle, a wrestling, a conflict (ἄθλησιν), which called forth their voluntary and active powers, and a great (πολλήν) struggle—no ordinary one—of suffering and affliction. To what *facts* this refers, whether the early history of the Christian Church in Palestine, including all its various persecutions, or possibly (with Alford) more recent persecutions in Rome, it is impossible to determine. The fact that it was a second generation, and not the early members of the Jerusalem Church, that would be now addressed, is against (yet not decisively) the former supposition.

33. Partly, whilst ye were made, etc. *On the one hand, being made a gazing stock* (*a spectacle*). **Both by reproaches and afflictions** (θεατρίζεσθαι, equivalent to θέατρον γενηθῆναι, 1 Cor. 4:9: "To be made a spectacle to the world and to angels and men"). Through reproaches and afflictions heaped upon them, they were held up, as it were, to the contemptuous gaze of the world. *On the other hand, becoming partakers with them who found themselves so situated;* namely, in affliction and reproach. '*So*' not referring back to endured, and denoting the firmness with which they endured the struggle, but to the 'being a gazing stock by afflictions and reproaches,' and indicating that these Christians had not only themselves borne affliction and obloquy for the cause of Christ, but had also attached themselves to those who, amid persecution and reproach, had maintained the Christian faith, and bestowed on them sympathy and succor. The Acts is full of the names of eminent leaders in the Church, as Stephen, Peter, James the First, Paul, etc.—objects of hate and persecution, and many of them losing their lives for the sake of Christ. It is to sympathy and aid extended to such as these that this probably refers.

34. This expresses the same thought as the preceding in reverse order. **For ye had,** etc.—*ye both sympathized with them that were in bonds, and ye received with joy the plundering of your goods.* The expression is emphatic, and indicates a record of the most satisfactory character. They took the plundering of their property, not only with resignation, but with joy. They 'rejoiced and were exceeding glad' when they suffered, knowing that 'great was their reward in heaven.' (Matt. 5:11.) *Knowing that ye have for yourselves a better and an enduring possession.* The added 'in heaven' of the Textus Receptus is probably a gloss. With or without it, the 'possession' is obviously the heavenly inheritance—the 'incorruptible' and 'undefiled' inheritance of 1 Peter 1:4. 'Have for yourselves' contrasts emphatically the treasure which is their own with the earthly goods which they held at the pleasure of others.

35 Cast not away therefore your confidence, which hath great recompense of reward.
36 For ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise.
37 For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry.
38 Now the just shall live by faith: but if *any man* draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him.

35 possession and an abiding one. Cast not away therefore your boldness, which hath great recompense of
36 reward. For ye have need of [1]patience, that, having done the will of God, ye may receive the promise.
37 For yet a very little while,
He that cometh shall come, and shall not tarry.
38 But [2]my righteous one shall live by faith:
And if he shrink back, my soul hath no pleasure in him.

1 Or, *steadfastness*.....2 Some ancient authorities read *the righteous one*.

35. The verse, in view of this noble record of the past, renews the exhortation. **Cast not away therefore** (μὴ ἀποβάλητε)—either, 'Lose not with an involuntary loss,' or, 'Throw not away voluntarily.' The verb will admit either signification. The latter seems, here, preferable, as it is also more strictly the meaning of the word. **Your confidence**—your joyful assurance—**which hath a great recompense.** Their joyful Christian confidence is not to be wantonly thrown away, or lightly parted with. It has an intrinsic value. God acknowledges, approves, and will reward it, in the fulfillment of all the hopes which it involves. This fulfillment God, although strictly as a matter of mere grace, yet in some sort as a *record* (similarly as at 6 : 10) for their firm and glad confidence, will bestow upon them.

36. For ye have need of patience (*steadfast endurance*), in order that, doing the will of God, ye may obtain the promise. The two last clauses may be resolved either temporally; 'that, *after* doing the will of God, ye may obtain,' etc.; or, instrumentally, 'that by doing the will ye may obtain'; or, both, regarded as parts of our complex idea; 'doing ye may obtain,' equivalent to 'ye may do and obtain.' The idea is, then, you need steadfastness that ye may do the will of God, and, so doing, obtain the promise. At all events, the idea is not that, having *already*, in time past, done the will of God, ye may in the future obtain the promise. Both the doing and the obtaining are yet in the future, and both conditioned upon steadfast endurance. Of course, the doing of God's will is not attributed to the Christian in the same absolute and perfect sense as in ver. 7 (I come to do thy will) to Christ. *That* indicates a voluntary obedience taking the place of a mere animal sacrifice, as the ground of an efficacious atonement; this indicates conformity to God's will and law, not as a ground, but as a condition, of salvation. To 'receive or obtain the promise' here, as often elsewhere, its fulfillment. They have been saved, as yet, only or mainly in hope. The fulfillment, the 'enduring substance,' comes when Christ shall return to those who look for him without sin unto salvation. So the next verse.

37, 38. A free quotation from Hab. 2 : 3, 4, introduced by a phrase from the Septuagint of Isa. 26 : 20. **For yet a little while** (*how little!*) This from Isa. 26 : 20, where God calls his people to enter into their chambers, and hide them a very little until the storm be overpast. **And he that shall come** (*cometh*) **will come, and will not tarry. Now** (*but*) **the just,** etc.—*On account of his faith shall he live, and if he shrink back, my soul hath no pleasure in him.* The words are freely quoted from a passage in Habakkuk, which has primary reference to the coming overthrow of the Chaldean dominion, and looks from thence, according to the habitual shortening of prophetic perspective, forward to the coming of the Messiah. The Septuagint version runs thus: "Because the vision is yet for a time, and it will appear at last, and will not come to nought. If he be tardy, wait for him; for he will surely come, and will not tarry. If (one) shrink back, my soul hath no pleasure in him; but the just, he, by his faith, shall live." In the Hebrew original, the 'vision'—namely, the revealed destruction of the Chaldean power—is still the subject of the following verb, 'will come and will not delay.' The Septuagint translators have given it a personal reference to God as the Messiah, and our author applies it definitely to Christ and to his second coming. He has also, in citing, reversed the order of the two last clauses, perhaps accidentally, perhaps to make the verb 'shrink, draw back' (ὑποστείληται) refer more definitely to the 'past' as its subject. In the original (Septuagint), the subject of the verb is clearly indefinite, 'if he,' that is, 'any one draw back'; and there is no gram-

39 But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul.

39 But we are not [1] of them that shrink back unto perdition; but of them that have faith unto the [2] saving of the soul.

1 Gr. *of shrinking back . . but of faith*.....2 Or, *gaining*.

matical reason why it may not be so in our Epistle. Looking at the Old Testament passage, I am strongly inclined to render, as in the English version, "and if any man draw back," and this not so much on theological as philological grounds. So far as the *sense* is concerned, it is entirely in harmony with the uniform tone of this Epistle to put, hypothetically, the case of the believer's falling away, and then to declare the hopelessness of his condition. Granting that the verb 'shrink, or draw back' refers to 'the just,' it makes just such a supposition as is repeatedly elsewhere made; and, as in all the other passages, does not commit the author to the positive doctrine that the really just man ever does fall away. The original again reads, either, "My (God's) just man shall live by faith," or, "The just man shall live by my faith"—that is, "faith in me." The text in Hebrew is uncertain; but, with Delitzsch, etc., we give it as cited in Rom. 1 : 17, where Paul makes it the starting point and text of his elaborate and noble exposition of the gospel doctrine of justification. Of course, as the author has not made a formal quotation, he has not studied a precise adherence to the original text. He has rather accommodated it to his purpose than strictly cited it as proof. Still, there can be no just doubt that he has, in the spirit of an enlarged and just interpretation, transferred the Old Testament picture to the New. All the lines of the Old Testament prophecy converge on the Messiah, and, with the progress of historical development, on his first coming, as the beginning, and on his second coming, as the crown and consummation of his work. The Old Testament faith changes its outward form, but not its essential character, as it fixes itself definitely on a revealed Messiah, and a Messiah yet again to be revealed in glory. So the just shall live in consequence of his trust in God, but at no time since the fall could this trust have been a mere confidence in the integrity, purity, and justice of God without a felt need of atonement and forgiveness; and since the appearing of Christ, it can take no other specific direction than toward his expiatory and interceding work. In this alone, the sin- and guilt-stricken soul of man finds its needs met. We may not know who, or how many, from the Gentile world have been saved without the proclamation of the gospel, but we hazard nothing in saying that whoever have, have been saved through the intercession of Christ, and so saved that their first glimpse of him and his redemption, wherever obtained, was welcomed by them as precisely adapted to their spiritual needs, as "all their salvation and all their desire." 'My soul,' Hebrew for 'I'—that is, God, whose language the writer is citing—'hath no pleasure in him'; that is, abhors and rejects him.

39. But again the writer's kindly feeling induces him to hope for the best in regard to his wavering brethren, and to let them feel that he has not lost confidence in their steadfastness. **But we are not of them that** (*such as*) **shrink back unto perdition, but of them that believe** (*are of faith*) **to the saving of the soul.** "Are not of shrinking back"—that is, we belong not to, are not the children of, shrinking back; are not such as to shrink back. 'Unto perdition'—that is, so that our course should end in perdition, in eternal destruction. 'Unto perdition' expresses the natural and inevitable result of the drawing back, as 'unto the gaining, or saving of the soul' expresses the natural result of faith. They are not added as that which the recreant on the one hand and the believer on the other *seeks* as his goal, but as the writer's statement of the necessary consequence of either course respectively. 'Perdition' is the losing of the soul; the 'gaining of the soul' is eternal life.

CHAPTER XI.

NOW faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.

1 Now faith is [1] assurance of *things* hoped for, a [2] con-
2 viction of things not seen. For therein the elders

1 Or, *the giving substance to* .....2 Or, *test.*

Ch. 11. (2) *Encouraging survey of the achievements of faith in Jewish history. Muster roll of the heroes of faith.* (1–40.)

Illustrations from Old Testament and ancient Jewish history of the power of that faith which is inculcated on the readers. The author uses the term 'faith' not in its narrower—more strictly, New Testament—sense, for faith in Jesus Christ as the condition of salvation, but in its broader character, as that principle within us which passes out of the visible and the present into the sphere of the invisible and the future, which thus postpones sensible objects to spiritual realities, and the evanescent present to the abiding future. Inasmuch as this faith exists only in hearts which God has touched by his grace,—a grace bestowed only through the atonement of Christ, either past or prospective,—there is no contradiction between the doctrine of this Epistle and the prevailing New Testament doctrine in regard to faith. Paul, in Romans, and our author, in Hebrews, are contemplating the subject from different points of view. The one has his eye on the moral law, and on the need of a righteousness appropriated by faith to cover our sin and guilt; the other is looking at the manner in which this in-dwelling principle of faith would evince itself in all ages, even when there was as yet no clear revelation of Christ. Paul himself, on other occasions, uses the word in the same sense; as 2 Cor. 5 : 7, 'We walk by faith, not by sight.'

(*a*) Illustrations of faith in the antedeluvian believers. (1–7.)

1. Now faith is, etc.—*But faith is confidence in things hoped for, a conviction of the things that are not beheld.* Some, from the position of "is" (ἐστιν) and the absence of the article from 'faith' (πίστις) have supposed they must construct 'and there *is* a faith,' making it a verb of *existence*, instead of a copula, and thus affirming emphatically that there *is* such a grace as faith, with the following nouns in apposition: A faith—to wit, a confidence, etc. But this without necessity. Such apposition of 'is' (ἐστιν), as copula, and such an absence of the article with the subject, are among the familiar usages of the language. The advanced position of the verb simply throws emphasis on it. 'But faith *is*,' etc.—equivalent to, But that which faith *is*, is this. We have thus a *definition* of faith, and a definition adapted to the purpose of the writer. He considers it in its two elements as related to *the future* and as related to *things unseen*. It seems now to be the author's purpose not to state, rhetorically, what faith may *prove* to those who possess it, but strictly what is its *nature* as a subjective exercise. The word 'substance' (ὑπόστασις), therefore, which means, primarily, *a standing under*, and then a *foundation*, *substance*, but which then comes in later Greek to mean *confidence* (see 3 : 14; 2 Cor. 9 : 4), seems to have much more naturally this meaning here (so Luther, and most recent interpreters); and, again, for 'evidence,' or, proof (ἔλεγχος), we understand here naturally the *conviction* furnished by the proof, the clear assurance of things not seen. We thus have a beautiful and complete definition of faith applicable to all the cases to which the author proceeds to apply it. The statement that 'Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen,' is indeed, rhetorically, just and beautiful, but less pertinent to the author's purpose than that which looks at this grace in its strictly subjective nature. This answers the question which we naturally ask, "What was faith, as exercised by those saints of the elder time?" It was an abiding confidence in anticipated good, and a clear conviction of unseen realities. It seems uncertain whether 'things' (πραγμάτων) belongs to the preceding clause or the following. The Greek interpreters construct it mostly with the preceding; the modern, mainly on rhythmical grounds, with the following. I incline to the earlier construction. It seems to me that while, perhaps, mere rhythm would favor the later construction, rhetorical force would point to the other. But it matters little.

2. For by it (*in this*) **the elders**—they of the elder time, elders not merely on the

2 For by it the elders obtained a good report.
3 Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.

3 had witness borne to them. By faith we understand that the [1] worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of

1 Gr. *ages.*

ground of age, but of dignity; looking upon them far back in the past, we naturally associate them with the dignity and venerableness of age—**obtained a good report** (*were attested*) received a good attestation, alike from God, who approved them, and history, that has recorded their deeds. 'In this' is probably to be constructed directly with the verb —not, "Being in this, they were attested," but, "they were attested in this," 'they received their attestation in this.'

The author passes now to a catalogue of the ancient heroes of the faith. He would naturally begin with Adam; but as what is recorded of him is rather a lamentable lapse from faith than an illustration of it, and as he leads the mind back to the very scene of creation, our author commences by illustrating the operation of faith in connection with this great, prime fact of history and article of belief.

3. By faith we understand that the worlds were (*have been*) **framed by the word of God**—*In order that not from things which are apparent should have sprung that which is seen.*

It may be objected to the author's statement that our recognition *by faith* of the creation of the world by the word of God, is inconsistent with the fact that this creation is matter of express record, and that we acquire the knowledge from that record. True; but in reply, we say that this record itself appeals to the principle of faith within us, without which we could not appreciate, and should not accept, the record. Faith is that general principle of our nature which, according to the definition (ver. 1) enables us to pass from the visible to the invisible, to rise above the phenomenal into the realm of spiritual reality and spiritual truth. Faith, then, accepts the testimony which God gives concerning creation; it establishes reason, *intellect* (νοῦς) upon its throne in opposition to sense; it enables us to discover the evidences that the universe has sprung from the power and wisdom of God, instead of having its origin in material and sensible causes. *We understand* (νοοῦμεν), we have an intellectual, rational perception, as Paul, in Romans, declares that the invisible things of God are clearly seen from the creation of the world, being understood (νοούμενα) from his works. So reason, under the influence of faith, recognizes God as the Author and Controller of the universe. 'The worlds' (αἰῶνας) —that is, the whole system of created things, the created universe. Moll makes these æons (αἰῶνες) to be the laws and potencies of the spiritual world, out of which have sprung, secondarily, the things which are seen, and which thus form the contrast to the 'things which appear.' But as it seems to me without reason, and to the great detriment of the simplicity and justness of the thought. 'The word of God' is not here the Logos, the hypostatic Word, but (as 1 : 4) the *utterance*, the decree or fiat of God (ῥῆμα) referring, probably, to the language, 'And God said.' 'In order that' (εἰς τό, implying purpose, not result).[1] This arrangement was made, and we made to discern rationally by faith the truth that the world has been framed by the word of God, in order that [to our apprehension] what is seen should not have sprung from what appears, in order that we might clearly see that the objects and phenomena which we behold have a higher than merely sensible origin. While man in his original constitution was made to see God in nature, by the fall he has lost that power, at least, that disposition. He now naturally banishes or ignores God in creation; he rests in material causes; he refers back the things which are seen to sensible causes and phenomena. Sin has cut the bond which, to the eye of man, unites the universe with the Creator. Faith restores that bond. It reunites the severed links of the great chain; it enables man to rise above the sphere of sensible causes, and once more see in the universe, with all its phenomena, a product of spiritual power. This is the simple teaching of the passage. It gives to faith its place as the grand power that binds the creation to the Creator. It is an exemplification, then, of that second element

1 The εἰς τό here, and the τοῦ μή of verse 5, may, indeed, denote simple result

4 By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh.

4 things which do appear. By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, through which he had witness borne to him that he was righteous, [1]God bearing witness [2]in respect of his gifts: and through it he being dead yet speaketh.

1 The Greek text in this clause is somewhat uncertain.....2 Or, *over his gifts.*

of faith; namely, that it is a 'conviction of things which are not seen.' The creation wrought by the word of God, by a spiritual agency, is an unseen, spiritual fact, which experience has shown can only be apprehended by faith. The wisdom of Greek philosophy never attained to it, hardly dreamed of it.

As to the construction. Many have taken the phrase μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων as equivalent to ἐκ τῶν μὴ φαινομένων, *from the things which do not appear*, and regarded this as equivalent to *nothing*, thus making the sentence signify "that that which is seen may [in their estimation] have sprung from nothing." But this would be totally to mistake the purpose of the writer. He has no wish or design to exalt *nothing*. It is not *nothing*, but God, from whom he declares all things to have sprung. This construction of 'not' (μή) is, indeed, barely possible; but even then we are under no necessity of supposing that the writer has made use of so awkward a periphrasis to express 'nothing'; on the contrary, it is much more natural to understand 'the things which do not appear' as spiritual powers and agencies.

But a far more natural construction of the 'not' (μή), and that now generally adopted, is with 'sprung' (γεγονέναι), "in order that not from things which appear may have sprung that which is seen." The inquiry, then, arises, "What is the antithesis to the 'things which appear,' and from which faith *does* recognize them to have sprung?" Moll declares it to be the æons before mentioned—spiritual laws and potencies; but, as it seems to me, with nothing to justify his intepretation, either in the thought or the language. Delitzsch contrasts with "*things which appear*" (φαινομένων) "intelligible things" (νοητά), invisible archetypes or patterns, after which, as existing in the divine mind, sensible and material things were constructed. This Platonic turn of the thought nothing in the passage warrants. It would seem that the antithesis to the "things which appear" lies on the very face of the passage, and in the natural drift and exigencies of thought. The writer is illustrating his definition of faith as a conviction of unseen things. What are these things? Simply God, with that system of truth of which he is the centre. By faith, then, we recognize that the universe has been framed *by the word of God*, in order that that which is seen, the phenomenal world on which we look, may be seen to have sprung, not from things which appear, but from what? —clearly from the word and power of God. Faith raises us from phenomenal to spiritual causes; from second and inefficient causes to the Supreme, the one great First Cause. Nothing can be simpler; and the passage thus interpreted is luminous and eloquent with a beautiful and fundamental truth.

4. By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent (πλείονα, *more, larger*—that is, qualitatively, in all the true attributes of a sacrifice; hence, *better*) **sacrifice than Cain.** In what respect better? Abel was a shepherd; Cain a husbandman; Abel brought of the first fruits of his flock; Cain of the first fruits of his field. Both were probably ostensibly thank offerings; neither of them ostensibly propitiatory. Yet Abel brought a *bloody* sacrifice, such as might befit a guilty person needing expiation before God. As each, however, brought the offering which belonged naturally to his vocation, it might seem that the difference was accidental, and that Abel brought his offering with as little consciousness of guilt and of a need of atonement as Cain. Our author, however, expressly declares that Abel brought his better offering by faith; thus, while he brought an intrinsically more appropriate sacrifice for a guilty being—a sacrifice of blood—the choice was not accidental, but was dictated by faith. In other words, there was already a recognition of man's need of an atonement, and a dim premonition and greeting in this very dawn of time, of the great oblation of Calvary. His faith embraced both elements; it embraced a conviction of unseen realities, and confidence in anticipated good. **By** (*through*) **which he obtained witness that he was**

5 By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God.

5 By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and he was not found, because God translated him: for [1] he hath had witness borne to him that before his translation he had been well-pleasing

1 Or, *before his translation he hath had witness borne to him.*

(*he was attested to be*) **righteous.** 'Through which' (ἧς) may refer either to 'faith' or 'sacrifice.' Grammatically, from its position, it would refer rather to the latter, and this makes a perfectly good sense, as in fact it was his sacrifice which, at least for history, produced the attestation. Still, as 'faith' is the prevalent idea, it is better, perhaps, to take it as referring to faith, and the 'through which he was attested' as corresponding to the 'were attested in this' of ver. 2. The testimony referred to is here not that of Christ (see above Matt. 23 : 35), but the testimony of God at the time, as borne both in his reception of the offering, and his subsequent avenging of the murder of the offerer. **God testifying of his gifts.** This refers to the declaration (Gen. 4 : 4) that 'God had respect to,' looked with approval upon, Abel and his offering, and undoubtedly signalized his acceptance by an outward sign, probably by consuming the victim with lightning. Some such manifest expression must be assumed, in order to account for the outburst of envy and wrath in Cain.

And by it (that is, clearly, by faith) **he being dead**—*after dying, though dead*—**yet** (*still*) **speaketh.** It seems extraordinary that the Greek interpreters, Chrysostom, Theodoret, with many more recent, should have taken the *still* here temporally, of the time of the author, and the verb 'speaketh' (λαλεῖ), also of the then present time; making the passage declare that through faith Abel still speaks to all after ages, exhorting them to faith (Chrysostom), or, *is spoken of* (equivalent to λαλεῖται, *is celebrated*, Theodoret). This, indeed, is a proper thing to say of Abel, as of any other ancient worthy, and no more of him *than* of any other, unless, perhaps, the author may choose to regard that voice with which after death Abel cries to God as still sounding on through the ages. But *that* voice was not an exhortation to faith, nor is it a voice of eulogy on the martyr. There can be no reasonable doubt, I think, that the passage refers to the crying of Abel's blood in the ears of God, immediately after his murder. The word *still* (ἔτι) is logical, not temporal, and by familiar Greek usage refers back to the participle; the verb 'speaketh' is the historical present, the two forming a sharp contrast to the preceding participle, 'upon dying, he still speaks'—he speaks even after he dies. 'The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground.' It was Abel's faith that caused God to hear, as it were, the cry of his blood as it sunk into the ground and to bring to account him who shed it. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints." Faith gives a voice to their wrongs in the ear of God.

5. By faith Enoch was translated—here elliptically; *by faith Enoch was enabled so to live that he was translated.* 'Translated'—that is, removed, from this world to God. "Withdrew to the divinity" (Josephus, "Antiquities 1 : 3, 4). We have here the inspired comment on the brief statement, Gen. 5 : 21. **That he should** (*might*) **not see death.** The Greek naturally means, *in order that he might not see*, rather than, 'so as not to see.' Nor is there any difficulty in this. God did not merely take Enoch, so that he *did* not, but with the purpose that he *should* not, 'see death.' He designed to snatch him away from the clutches of death, and thus vindicate his extraordinary piety, and perhaps give to that elder time a token of a future existence. **And he was not found, because God translated** (*removed*) **him.** The phrase is the Septuagint rendering of the Hebrew, "and was not because God took him." **For before his translation he** (*has*) **had witness borne to him that he** (*has been attested to have*) **pleased God.** The phrase 'pleased God' (εὐαρεστεῖν τῷ θεῷ) is again the Septuagint for the Hebrew "walked with God," and expresses its substantial meaning, denoting that intimacy, that walking with God, which is the result and reward, as well as the process, of a life of piety. The passage admits one or two different constructions. If we take the 'before his removal' with 'has been attested'—that is, 'he has been attested before his removal'—then probably the preposition 'before' is to be taken *locally*, and the words 'his removal

6 But without faith *it is* impossible to please *him:* for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and *that* he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.
7 By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith.

6 unto God: and without faith it is impossible to be well-pleasing *unto him:* for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and *that* he is a rewarder of
7 them that seek after him. By faith Noah, being warned *of God* concerning things not seen as yet, moved with godly fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; through which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is

for the passage which records his removal. Thus we have: "For before the record of his removal he has had the testimony borne to him that he pleased God," as in fact the declaration that he pleased God immediately precedes the statement that he was not found because God took him. If, on the other hand, we take the clause 'before his removal' with the verb 'to have pleased,' then the preposition is to be taken *temporally*, and we have, "for he stands attested previously to his removal to have pleased God." The perfect, 'he has been attested' (μεμαρτύρηται), probably denotes that the fact of the attestation stands before our eyes.

6. The author proceeds with his usual deliberation. He has not yet given his proof, only collected the materials for it. We have found that Enoch enjoyed the extraordinary prerogative of escaping death. But this was because 'he pleased God;' and the author now draws his inference. **But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God**—not (as some), "he who goes to God as did Enoch," but, as in former chapters, "he who approaches God in sacrifice and worship" (4:16; 7:24; 10:22) **must believe that he is**—must have that element of faith which is a conviction of unseen realities, of spiritual truth. **And that he is** (*proves*) **a rewarder of them that diligently** (*earnestly*) **seek him**—must have that other element of faith which consists in confidence in future blessings, as the result and reward of present fidelity. Thus faith always looks into the unseen and forward to the future. We cannot truly believe that God *is*, without also believing that he exists as a Being who cares for and will reward virtue. The *must* (δεῖ), *it is necessary*, expresses, however, rather a logical than a moral necessity. It behooves, indeed, every one to believe that God is; but here the author is establishing a point, and the 'must' marks simply the necessary connection between his premise and his conclusion.

7. We pass from Enoch to the hero of the flood. **By faith Noah, being warned of God**—*concerning things not seen as yet;* that is, of God's purpose to destroy the world by a deluge. Of that deluge there were not as yet the slightest sensible indications. The declaration of God, communicated we know not how, was Noah's only evidence in the case, and his act therefore was an act of pure faith in a Being unseen, and an event wholly beyond the sphere of sense. Noah's faith, too, was doubtless sorely tried. He built the ark slowly before an unbelieving and mocking world. Often must he have been sorely tempted to abandon the work which they stigmatized as foolish and fanatical, and join them in that careless revelling, that utter disregard of everything beyond the present (Matt. 24:37-40), which characterized them—"they knew not till the flood came and destroyed them all"—but he persevered in faith. **Moved with fear** (*in reverent fear or foresight*), **prepared an ark to the saving** (*safety*) **of his house.** 'Moved with fear' is not a very happy rendering of the verb (εὐλαβηθείς). Either 'in reverent fear' or 'in reverent foresight.' I prefer the former: 'giving reverent heed to the divine declarations.' **By** (*through*) **which he condemned the world.** 'Through which' might (as Chrysostom and many) agree with 'ark'; he condemned the world through the ark which he built; or, with salvation, 'safety'; he condemned the world through the salvation which he obtained by building the ark. Neither of these meanings is entirely inapposite. Yet it is better, doubtless, in conformity with the controlling idea of the chapter, to refer it to faith. By faith he condemned the world. His long, patient, believing, waiting upon God, while the ark was preparing and the world was scoffing, itself pronounced condemnation on an unbelieving and scoffing world, *and he*, on the other hand, **became heir** (*inheritor*—that is, *possessor*) **of the righteousness which is by** (*according to*) **faith.** The expression has reference, probably, to the fact that Noah is the first who in the Old Testament is expressly

8 By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went.
9 By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as *in* a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise:

8 according to faith. By faith Abraham, when he was called, obeyed to go out unto a place which he was to receive for an inheritance; and he went out, not
9 knowing whither he went. By faith he became a sojourner in the land of promise, as in a *land* not his own, [1] dwelling in tents, with Isaac and Jacob, the

1 Or, *having taken up his abode in tents.*

called 'righteous.' (Gen. 6 : 9; compare Ezek. 14 : 14, 20.) Some have supposed, but with no sufficient reason, that Noah is called 'heir' or 'inheritor' of the righteousness of faith, as entering into and, as it were, inheriting that righteousness which had already belonged to Abel and Enoch. It has probably a single and absolute reference to Noah. Noah was a righteous man and a 'preacher of righteousness'; but as in the author's conception (or in the fact of the case) there could be no righteousness that did not rest upon faith in invisible and spiritual realities, his righteousness is called, in conformity with the main tenor of the chapter, 'the righteousness according to faith.' There could be no other, for none could be righteous who did not please God, and without faith it is impossible to please him. I do not see the necessity of supposing any polemical reference to Paul's doctrine of the 'righteousness of faith.' The standing point of the two writers is entirely different. Paul is discussing the principle of justification in view of the claims of the moral law, and the atonement of a manifested and crucified Saviour. Our author considers that principle as operating long ages before there was any distinct exhibition of the atonement. Paul's mode of stating the doctrine of faith in relation to Abraham (Rom. 4) will be found on examination to coincide precisely with that of our author. Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Just so according to this chapter, Noah, Abraham, Moses, etc. Every act of faith in the saints of the Old Testament involved the *generic* character of that faith which in the gospel concentrates itself upon the person and finished work of Jesus Christ. They trusted God, they took him at his word; they felt a sense of unworthiness and a need of forgiveness, and discerning dimly, very dimly, the rudiments of a gracious economy, cordially and savingly embraced it.

(*b*) Example of Abraham and Sarah. (8–12.)

8. By faith Abraham, when he was called—*being called*—that is, *being summoned* (Gen. 12 : 1-4); not "he who was called Abraham," as some, led by the present participle, have supposed. The present participle is finely used to denote that, not '*upon* being called' (κληθείς), but '*while* being called' (καλούμενος) he obeyed. His obedience responded instantly and half anticipatingly to the call. **Obeyed**—hearkened obediently to the call (ὑπακούω, the word being selected as corresponding to καλεῖν). The call of Abraham was to abandon his country and go forth into a region which God should show him; he hastened **to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance**—this place was Canaan. **And he went out, not knowing whither he** *cometh*—historical present for *went*. Abraham's trust was absolute and extraordinary. It was not until he reached Canaan that he knew even his place of destination. But his faith embraced the elements of a conviction of the unseen, and confidence in future good. Like a child, he placed his hand in the hand of this unseen Father, to be led whither he himself knew not.

9. By faith he sojourned in (παρῴκησεν, in classic Greek, *dwelt along side;* in Hellenistic Greek, dwelt as stranger or sojourner); 'sojourned into' (εἰς), a pregnant construction for '*went into and sojourned there*,' as is common in Greek. **The land of promise**—the land which God promised to give to his posterity, Acts 7 : 5. **As in a strange** (*an alien*) **country**—as, though promised to his posterity, yet belonging to another people, and himself as having in it no right of possession. "God did not give to him of the land so much as to put his foot on." In what, then, did Abraham's faith consist? Was it in his sojourning in a land which did not belong to him, on the strength of the promise that his posterity should receive it? Or was it in his dwelling in a land which his posterity were to receive, and which thus was by anticipation his, as if it belonged to strangers, and thus declaring himself a pilgrim on the earth? Doubtless

10 For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker *is* God.
11 Through faith also Sarah herself received strength to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child when she

10 heirs with him of the same promise: for he looked for the city which hath the foundations, whose
11 [1] builder and maker is God. By faith even Sarah herself received power to conceive seed when she

1 Or, *architect.*

his faith embraced both elements. He sojourned, under the promise of God, in a land of strangers, on the strength of God's promise that it should belong to his posterity. Again, although it was thus in some sort his own, he sojourned in it *as* belonging to strangers, and thus, neither returning to his old home, nor having any present home, he lived in a state of voluntary exile, seeking a country and a city to come. It is then his sojourning in this land, *as an alien land*, that the writer has now specially in view, as in so doing he renounced all earthly inheritance, and declared his trust in a higher spiritual and future good. Both the elements of faith entered largely into his —a conviction of unseen realities, confidence in future good.

Dwelling in tabernacles with (not σύν, *together with*, implying accompaniment, but μετά, *in common with*, implying participation). Isaac, to be sure, dwelt in tents *in company* with Abraham, but Jacob did not. **Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise.** Abraham, though rich in herds and flocks and servants, was prohibited from building or occupying any town, or even permanent dwelling house. His mode of life, as well as that of his sons, was primitive and nomadic; he lived in tents, which enabled him easily to transport himself from one place to another. Something of this may be due to the migratory habits of an Oriental nomad chief, but much more, we may be sure, to that divine dispensation which made the life of Abraham, in its perpetual demand for and exercise of faith, a pre-eminent pattern for the believers who were to be his spiritual offspring.

10. For he looked for a (*was awaiting the*) **city which hath foundations** (or, *the foundations*). Not (with Grotius and some) the earthly Jerusalem—a reference so inapposite that it seems inexplicable how any should have so understood it—but the Jerusalem which is above (Gal. 4 : 26), "the heavenly Jerusalem, the city of the living God" (12 : 22), which hath foundations (see Rev. 21 : 14, for the foundations of the Jerusalem descended from God out of heaven), and which is thus stable and abiding, as against the changing and temporary character of tent life. That Abraham was with a distinct consciousness looking for the heavenly Jerusalem as his future home, we need not assert nor suppose. The latent elements of the Old Testament faith come first to clear consciousness in the New, and in the light of its clearer revelations the New Testament writers can both interpret the dark hints of the Old and the real nature and objects of the faith of the early saints. But that such was the real essence of that faith we may infer from those traditions of the Synagogue and articles of Jewish belief which gradually explicated themselves out of the Old Testament records, and prepared the way for the fuller revelations of the gospel. Martha's declaration to our Lord that her brother should rise again at the resurrection at the last day seems but the more articulate utterance of the faith of those ancient worthies (see ver. 35 and compare 2 Macc. 7) who laid down their lives in hope of 'a better resurrection,' thus assuring us that even the doctrine of the resurrection was not without its Old Testament foreshadowings. So the heavenly, as contrasted with the earthly Jerusalem, is a Jewish doctrine before the coming of Christ and its descent to earth after the Second Coming, as in Revelation, is in harmony with Jewish belief respecting what should happen in the times of the Messiah.

Whose builder and maker (*whose architect and builder*) **is God**—(as *planner* of this city God is its τεχνίτης; as its actual *founder and builder*, its δημιουργός).

11. Through faith also Sarah herself. This emphasis on Sarah either as contrasted with her husband, who, as the head of the woman and as being pre-eminent in faith, would naturally in this relation be alone noticed; or, as having been previously barren; or (with Lünemann, Delitzsch, Moll, etc.) because she had at the first been unbelieving as to God's promise (Gen. 18 : 12, 15), whence her transition to a state of faith was the more remarkable. **Received strength to conceive**

was past age, because she judged him faithful who had promised.
12 Therefore sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, *so many* as the stars of the sky in multitude, and as the sand which is by the sea shore innumerable.
13 These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of *them*, and embraced *them*, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.
14 For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country.

was past age, since she counted him faithful who
12 had promised: wherefore also there sprang of one, and him as good as dead, *so many* as the stars of heaven in multitude, and as the sand, which is by the sea shore, innumerable.
13 These all died [1] in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them and greeted them from afar, and having confessed that they were
14 strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things make it manifest that they are seek-

1 Gr. *according to.*

seed (*for the founding of an offspring*), or with many (as Chrysostom, Theophylact, etc.), 'for the reception and conceiving of seed.' **When she was past age** (*and that contrary to the period of her life*), as she was now past the age at which offspring might have been expected, even had she previously had children. **Because** (*since*) **she counted him faithful who had promised.** Thus Sarah, like Abraham, her lord, staggered not at the promise through unbelief, believing that what God had promised he was able to accomplish. "Against hope"—that is, against all rational ground of probability she believed in hope.

12. Therefore sprang there, etc.—*Wherefore also there were begotten from one* (Abraham), *and that, too, when become as dead* (νενεκρωμένον, *deadened*, having lost his reproductive power. The same epithet is applied to Abraham's body (Rom. 4 : 19), as also to the like condition of Sarah); [*a seed*]; *as the stars of the sky in multitude, as the sand which is along the border of the sea, the innumerable.* Such are the terms of the promise to Abraham. (Gen. 13 : 16; 15 : 5; 22 : 17, etc.) And the promise has been, and will be fulfilled, alike in Abraham's natural and his spiritual seed.

(*c*) Retrospective glance at the above-cited believers. (13–16.)

13. These all (*Abraham and the patriarchs, not the antediluvian worthies*) **died in faith**—not, 'by faith,' as before, because faith was not the *cause* of their death—**not having received the promises** (that is, *the fulfillment of them*), **but seeing and greeting them** (ἀσπασάμενοι, not, 'embracing,' but, 'saluting,' as one salutes the harbor and shore which he is approaching). That is, their death of faith corresponded to their life of faith. The declaration is not that they died in faith, because they had not received the promises, but had seen them, etc. (this would require οὐ κομισάμενοι instead of μή); but their death was a death in accordance with faith, as being a death of those who had not received the promise, but who saw and greeted them; that is, the author does not tell us that these men died in faith, not in sight, and then assign as the reason that they had not received, etc. But he tells us that their death had the character of faith in that without receiving the fulfilled promises, they yet saw and greeted them from afar. **And confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims** (*sojourners*) **on the earth.** This was part of their dying in faith, that though they had not received the promises, they yet saw and greeted them; and were thus willing, in view of the higher and greater blessings which these promises held out, to regard themselves as strangers and pilgrims on the earth. The language refers to that of Abraham. (Gen. 23 : 4.) They thus showed that they had that faith which rises above the sensible, and passes beyond the present, and takes hold of unseen and enduring good.

14. For they that say such things declare plainly (*show*) **that they seek** (*are seeking*) **a** (equivalent to *their*) **country** (*a fatherland*). The man who styles himself a sojourner and an exile, clearly implies that he has in view somewhere a country which shall be to him his country, a fatherland, of which he can use that endearing language, 'my country.' The English language is unfortunate in having no single word which (without the prefix of the possessive pronoun) expresses the difference between the Greek *region, territory* (χώρα), and *native land, fatherland* (πατρίς), country as the home of one's ancestors and the place of his citizenship. This is the force of the term here. The Germans render it adequately and beautifully by "Fatherland"; we have to leave its most essential idea unexpressed and dependent on explanation. It is not natural for man to be a mere

15 And truly, if they had been mindful of that *country*
from whence they came out, they might have had op-
portunity to have returned.
16 But now they desire a better *country*, that is, a
heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called
their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.

15 ing after a country of their own. And if indeed
they had been mindful of that *country* from which
they went out, they would have had opportunity to
16 return. But now they desire a better *country*, that
is, a heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed of
them, to be called their God: for he hath prepared
for them a city.

cosmopolite, a rover. As his heart demands a home, so his inextinguishable sentiments demand a 'country.' The reasoning of the author is just: the very fact of these patriarchs styling themselves pilgrims and sojourners pointed to a demand of their heart and their faith for a land which they could call their country.

15. And truly, if, etc.—*And if, indeed* (when they were thus styling themselves), *they had had in mind* (were making mention of) *that* [fatherland] *from which they came forth.* If Abraham, for example, when (Gen. 23 : 4) he calls himself a sojourner and a pilgrim, had referred to his present residence as compared with the land of his birth, **they might** (*would*) **have had opportunity to return**—and return assuredly they would, argues the author, if they had had no higher and better hope in the future. No man loves to be an alien and exile; but they consented to spend a life of estrangement from country, city, and home, and the only ground and justification of their procedure is their faith that laid hold, as the reward of their earthly disfranchisement, on a future and better country.

16. But now (*as it is*, νῦν, logical, *now, as the case stands, in fact*) **they desire** (*are seeking for*) **a better country, that is, a heavenly.** If there were doubt about 'the city that hath foundations' (ver. 10), whether, that is, it refers to the earthly (as Ebrard), or to the heavenly Jerusalem, this language would seem to settle it. If they were seeking a heavenly *country*, they would surely seek the heavenly *city*—the metropolis of the country. As to the sentiment, we may well admit that our author has *explicated* more from the language of the patriarchs than was distinctly in their consciousness. They may have acquiesced in their own disfranchised and alien condition consciously on the ground of the entrance of their posterity into an inheritance which was withheld from them. But the author has not drawn more from their language and conduct than, in the light of the New Testament, was implicitly contained in them. The whole interpretation hangs together. If the lineal descendants of Abraham were not the true people of God, but only typified them; if the rest of Canaan was not the true rest, but only symbolical of the Sabbath rest into which the real Israel shall enter; if all this was actually wrapped up in these promises—then the faith of the patriarchs, which led them to submit, in view of the promises, to a long life of earthly expatriation, contained precisely that element, though half latent to themselves, which is here ascribed to it. The whole gist of the matter is involved in that remarkable language of Christ: "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad." (John 8 : 36.)

Wherefore God is not ashamed (*of them*) **to be called their God.** God revealed himself specially as the 'God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob' (Exod. 3 : 6; Acts 3 : 13, etc.), which indeed became his familiar designation. The extraordinary faith of these patriarchs, their lifelong expatriation in simple reliance on his promise—a promise which in their day never seemed to have advanced a step toward realization—earned for them this eminent prerogative. On the other hand, that it was still an act of *condescension* in God; that, extraordinary as was their faith, it could lay him under no obligation so to honor them, is here (as at 2 : 11, where the like term is applied to the Redeemer's entering into brotherly relations with his people) beautifully implied in the 'not ashamed' (αἰσχύνεται). God *has* to humble himself in allowing himself to be so designated.

For he hath prepared for them a city. This again not the earthly, but the heavenly Jerusalem, the city of the living God, which is here represented as prepared for the patriarchs. This is in conformity with the typology of the context. God gave their natural seed the earthly Canaan; he gave to their spiritual seed, along with them, the heavenly Canaan. He built, or had built for their literal seed, the earthly Jerusalem; he built himself ('whose architect and builder was God') for their spir-

17 By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten *son*.
18 Of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called:

17 By faith Abraham, being tried, [1] offered up Isaac; yea, he that had gladly received the promises was
18 offering up his only begotten *son*; *even he* [2] to whom
19 it was said, In Isaac shall thy seed be called: ac-

1 Gr. *hath offered up*.....2 Or, *of*.

itual seed, and of course for them in an eminent degree, the heavenly Jerusalem. The city is, of course, again placed in contrast with the movable tent, which marked their migratory and shifting life. [The logical 'for' (γάρ) states the ground on which we *know* that he was not ashamed, etc. It states a single point as illustrative of that truth.]

(*d*) Examples of the Jewish patriarchs. (17-22.)

17. Another feature illustrative of faith in the life of the 'father of the faithful.' As Abraham was indebted to his own faith and Sarah's for the birth of Isaac, so his faith received another extraordinary trial in regard to him. Many have taken offense at the incipient offering of Isaac, but I do not see on what just grounds. He who gives life has a right to take it in what manner he pleases, and it lies as much in his sovereign pleasure to commission a father to plunge the sacrificial knife into the bosom of a child as to commit the taking of life to the agencies of nature, or to the ministers of civil justice. The only thing required to justify the command on the one hand, and the implicit obedience on the other, is the evidence that there are, or may be, sufficient intrinsic grounds for the proceeding. These, I think, can be discovered in the present case. Looking upon Isaac as the heir of promise, this command to put him to death was perhaps the severest test to which Abraham's faith in God could possibly be put. Looking again at him as a type of Christ, and at the probable place of the transaction as the scene of the great substitutionary sacrifice of the ages, we see reason for God's selecting precisely this form of trial; and it no more indicates a barbarous age than does his demand for the expiatory blood of Christ as the only salvation of humanity, or his committing to human tribunals the universal right to take life for adequate offenses. So long as sin is in the world, death will reign in every form in which the righteous Moral Ruler sees fit to inflict it.

By faith Abraham, when he was (*being*) **tried,** (*hath*) **offered up Isaac.** The perfect tense, instead of the aorist, represents the act as performed and on record before the eyes of man. The perfect brings it into relation to the present time. It is here also spoken of as done; "he has offered him up," because in fact the entire act was contemplated in his faith, and the failure to consummate it was, so far as concerned Abraham's faith, a mere accident. He intended when he bound Isaac on the altar to slay him; any mental reservation would have vitiated his faith. When the writer, however, throws the act back into the past he states the case more exactly. **And he that had received** (*accepted*) **the promises.** Abraham had not merely 'received' (δέχομαι) the promises; he had 'accepted' them (ἀναδέχομαι), he had appropriated them, acted on them, and thus seemingly exposed his whole plan and course of life to utter subversion and overthrow by this act of obedience. **Offered** (*was offering*) **up** (*started to offer up, commenced offering up*—here the author, in resuming, is more exact) **his only begotten.** The epithet 'only begotten' sharpens the conception of the faith involved in the act. It does so doubly, since to slay his only begotten would be doubly wounding to the parental heart, and since after this 'only begotten' there was no one left in whom the great promises to which he had sacrificed his earthly life could be realized. The latter is here probably the point mainly in view.

18. Of (*in relation to*) **whom it was said.** The rendering "to whom" referring "whom" to him 'who had accepted the promises' to Abraham, is more generally adopted, but I believe erroneously. The preposition (πρός with the accusative) will bear equally well the rendering 'in relation to' (see 1 : 7, 8), and the 'whom' then refers to the 'only begotten' Isaac. Either construction is possible, but with the latter the quotation becomes more forcible and of more pregnant import. **That in Isaac shall thy seed be called.** (Gen. 21 : 12.) This again is added as heightening our impression of his faith, by showing how com-

19 Accounting that God *was* able to raise *him* up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure.

counting that God *is* able to raise up, even from the dead; from whence he did also in a figure receive

pletely his obedience was to subvert the promise.

19. Accounting (*estimating*, coming to a rational conclusion) **that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead**—or better, as a general truth, *That God is able even to raise from the dead.* This consideration might seem at first view to detract from the faith of Abraham. If he reflected that God could, and thought it very possible that he would, raise Isaac from the dead, the difficulty and heroism of putting him to death seem greatly diminished. But here is precisely the pith of the writer's argument. He has not in mind the struggle of Abraham's feelings in yielding up his only begotten son, his heroism in performing a difficult and dreadful act, but the *implicitness and absoluteness* of that faith which enabled him to do it. For Abraham to have proceeded to slay Isaac in accordance with the divine command, but with the conviction or the fear that the promise was thus to be nullified, would have been an act of obedience indeed, but by no means distinctively an act of faith. His faith consisted in reconciling the great seeming contradictions in the circumstances of the case. He had received promises guaranteed by the veracity of Jehovah, whose fulfillment required the life of Isaac, and he was now commanded to perform an act which, to the eye of sense, extinguished those promises forever. Abraham did not seize either one horn of the dilemma. He did not either cling to the promise and refuse the sacrifice, or yield obedience and abandon the promise. His obedience did not hesitate, and his faith did not falter. He believed that God could and would fulfill his promise, and that in this fulfillment he would raise Isaac from the dead. Thus it is not mere *moral heroism*, the sacrifice of paternal affection, despairing obedience, that the author is here celebrating; but *faith*, confidence in spiritual realities—a belief that God *is*, and that he will accomplish his promises and reward his servants. It is faith in its double aspect of confidence in what is hoped for, and conviction of what is unseen.

From whence also he received him in a figure (*back*). Of all the interpretations put on this much disputed clause, this is, on the whole, perhaps liable to the least objection. It lies naturally in the words, takes 'figure' (παραβολῇ) in its usual New Testament sense, and makes an unexceptionable and appropriate meaning. We must be careful, however, not to reduce the meaning of 'in a figure' (ἐν παραβολῇ) to a mere 'as it were' or 'so to speak' (ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν), which deprives it of all its force. We must give it, on the contrary, its full signification. Abraham considered that God was able to raise Isaac from the dead, and from the dead he symbolically received him. Isaac, stretched upon the altar, lay in a typical death. He did not really feel the power of death, but lay in its likeness or image; and in a likeness or symbol, as one who had been devoted to death and subject to its power, his father received him back. It can scarcely be doubted that the author regards Isaac here as a type of Christ, and that in this latent view lies the real explanation. Isaac was to be put to death, and underwent all the outward forms involved in dying; but finally, when God's purpose was accomplished, he was raised without actually tasting of death. He thus typified our Lord, who indeed was not only bound and condemned, but actually drank the cup of death. Still his death, after all, in comparison with ordinary human death, was as the death of Isaac; it was but a seeming, a parabolic death. Death, in the very act of striking, lost his hold upon his victim. He had over Christ no real power. The Saviour laid down his life, but he took it again; snatched himself from the mortality and corruption of the grave, and thus, like Isaac, died but in a figure (ἐν παραβολῇ). The points of resemblance then are greater than the points of contrast. Abraham received Isaac from the dead in a figure, just as the Father received his Son who was crucified. Both were condemned to death, both stretched out upon the altar; but over neither had death any power; over the one, because the slaughtering knife was arrested in its descent; over the other, because, although it fell and his blood flowed, yet it could not reach his essential vitality, nor prevent him from speedily and triumphantly emerging from the realm of death. The raising of Isaac, then, was an acted parable. It stood along-

20 By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau concerning things to come.
21 By faith Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed both the sons of Joseph: and worshipped, *leaning* upon the top of his staff.
22 By faith Joseph, when he died, made mention of

20 him back. By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau
21 even concerning things to come. By faith Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph; and worshipped, *leaning* upon the top of his
22 staff. By faith Joseph, when his end was nigh, made

side of, symbolized, represented, an actual raising from the dead. And the special propriety of so representing it here is that it thus points forward to a similar, but far more momentous transaction, occurring on this very spot, in which ages after, the great Son of Promise, the spiritual Isaac, in whom the seed of Abraham were to be called, was thus by his death for a moment to darken the hopes of his followers, and apparently defeat the promises, but in reality to rise again essentially untouched by its power.

To enumerate all the explanations of this difficult passage would be almost endless. I will add a few. They have turned on the different meanings given, partly to the adverb '*whence*' (ὅθεν), partly to the verb *received*, or '*recovered*' (ἐκομίσατο), but chiefly to the words 'in a figure' (ἐν παραβολῇ). In regard to the first, it has been doubted whether the adverb (ὅθεν) was to be taken locally '*from whence*,' or logically, as everywhere else in this Epistle, '*whence*,' *from which cause*. As to the second, it has been doubted whether the verb (ἐκομίσατο) meant *received, bore off to himself, obtained*, referring to the original obtaining of Isaac, or *received back, recovered*, referring to his present receiving him as from the dead. The meanings of the phrase 'in a figure' (ἐν παραβολῇ) are much more various. It has been read 'in a figure or symbol' (equivalent to εἰς παραβολήν); namely, of the resurrection of the dead, or of the resurrection of Christ, or of both. It has been rendered as an adverb (equivalent to παραβόλως), *unexpectedly, wonderfully*: 'in the way of substitution,' by the substitution of the ram; 'in his presenting or delivering him up'; 'in a bold venture,' etc.

20. By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau concerning things to come. Things still in the future, and which, therefore, he could predict only in faith in a Being at once omniscient and omnipotent. Apart from faith, all forecasting of the future is but shrewd conjecture, and all prediction is fanaticism or knavery. Isaac foretold the mutual relations of Jacob and Esau (Gen. 27 : 22-29), giving to Jacob, the younger, the preference, as is indicated also by the first place being given to him here.

21. By faith Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed both (*each of*) **the sons of Joseph.** Ephraim and Manasseh (Gen. 48 : 20) here again also, as in the blessing of Jacob and Esau, reversing the natural relations of the two, and putting the younger before the elder —a feature which made the element of faith more marked and conspicuous. Here, as in the preceding case, confidence in God, the Unseen Ruler, and the conviction that he was speaking under his inspiration, vindicated to his blessing the character of faith. **And worshipped** (*bowed in worship*), **leaning upon the top of his staff.** The Hebrew is supposed to mean "And prostrated himself in worship upon the head of his bed"—that is, turned himself in worship so as to bring his face to the pillow. The Septuagint adopted a different pointing from the Masoretic (reading מַטֶּה, *staff*, for מִטָּה, *bed*), having in mind, perhaps (Gen. 32 : 10), "With my staff I crossed over the Jordan." The difference between the Hebrew and Septuagint was, however, of slight consequence to the author, and it was not necessary to correct the version. A more serious difficulty, perhaps, is found in the fact that this worshiping of Jacob is recorded not in connection with the blessing of the sons of Joseph, but with his directing Joseph concerning his burial. (Gen. 47 : 31.) Here, again, we may simply say that the author selected that event from the closing life of Jacob, which best—or, at least, sufficiently—illustrated the patriarch's faith; and, in connection with this, introduced the equally pertinent fact of his 'worshiping' as also illustrative of his faith. The close connection in which the two events stand render the transfer easy. He might have mentioned that just alluded to, or the blessing pronounced in the spirit of prophetic faith on all his sons (Gen. 49), but he lets one example stand for the whole.

22. By faith Joseph, when he died—*when dying* (τελευτῶν); *ending his life* (Gen. 50 : 26, ἐτελεύτησε)—**made mention of the departing of the children** (*sons*) **of Israel; and gave**

the departing of the children of Israel; and gave commandment concerning his bones.
23 By faith Moses, when he was born, was hid three months of his parents, because they saw *he was* a proper child; and they were not afraid of the king's commandment.
24 By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter;
25 Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season;

mention of the departure of the children of Israel;
23 and gave commandment concerning his bones. By faith Moses, when he was born, was hid three months by his parents, because they saw he was a goodly child; and they were not afraid of the king's com-
24 mandment. By faith Moses, when he was grown up, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter;
25 choosing rather to be evil entreated with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a sea-

commandment concerning his bones. Though early transported to Egypt, and there having flourished through a long period of prosperity and power, and though his family were now all happily, and, apparently, permanently located there, Joseph yet remembered the promise, and his heart and his faith turned to the true home of Israel. His command concerning his bones was made in the full faith that, against all present appearances, the promise would yet be fulfilled, and with firm trust, therefore, in the being and the veracity of the unseen but Omnipotent Promiser. His dying request was complied with. (Ex. 13:19.) His bones were placed (Josh. 24:32) in Shechem, in the field purchased by his father.

(*e*) Example of Moses. (23–29.)

From the patriarchs of Israel, the writer passes to its great leader, Moses.

23. By faith Moses, when he was born, was hidden three months of (*by*) **his parents** (*πατέρων*—literally, *fathers;* put here for father and mother) **because they saw he was a proper child**—or, *that the child was fair* (Acts 7:20), a child 'divinely fair' (*ἀστεῖον τῷ θεῷ, fair for God*). It was no mere human admiration of its beauty that moved the parents to save the life of the child; but something in the character of its beauty, which marked it for a higher destiny, for the fulfillment of some divine purpose. Their faith consisted apparently in this—that, recognizing the child as born for some special mission, they disobeyed the mandate of the king for his destruction. Without a divinely infused spiritual element in their motive, God would not have given them the faith for its execution. Nor did their hiding of Moses indicate a lack of faith. Precisely the reverse. Their purpose to *save* Moses in disregard of the royal edict, indicated faith, and led to their using the necessary means of saving him. Without the using of those means, faith would not have been faith, but presumption. It is not audacity, nor mere courage, that the author celebrates, but faith—the divinely inspired principle that believes in the future and beholds the unseen.

24. By faith Moses, *when he was grown up—being grown* to manhood; literally, *becoming large, or grown* (Exod. 2:11); according to Acts 7:23, about forty years old; not, as some, "becoming great in reputation and power"—**refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter.** The absence of the article before 'daughter' may be accidental; or it may be intended to turn attention from the person to the rank—a daughter of the royal family of Egypt. This refusal (or, denial) may not have been made on any specific occasion. His refusal was a practical one; it first evinced itself outwardly, and, perhaps, to his own consciousness, in the *acts* by which he showed that his heart and his allegiance were with his people and their God, perhaps by his slaying the Egyptian, and his flight to Midian. (Exod. 2:12, 15.)

25. Choosing (not, *having chosen*, as the tense of the participle allows, but does not require; the 'refusing' and the 'choosing' appear as coincident) **rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season** (*have a temporary enjoyment from sin*).

'*To suffer affliction*' (*κακουχεῖσθαι, to be ill-treated*), to meet treatment such as the Jews were then experiencing from Pharaoh, who knew not Joseph. When Moses made his choice the people were in ignominious and degrading bondage. He chose to share their fortunes, yet, in a divinely inspired faith (Acts 7:25) that through his hand God would work their salvation. We must remember that throughout this catalogue it is not natural courage or patriotism that is celebrated, but the faith that apprehends alike both the unseen and the future. 'The people of God'—the standing name of the Jews in the Old Testament, not as necessarily involving a spiritual character, but marking their divine

26 Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward.

26 son; accounting the reproach of [1] Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt: for he looked

1 Or, *the Christ.*

selection. God had chosen the patriarchs, and they had expanded into 'a people.' Under Moses they were to become an organized community—the Old Testament 'people of God.' 'The temporary enjoyment of sin'—not exactly equivalent to our phrase, "The pleasures of sin for a season." The reference is not to what are strictly called sinful pleasures. The 'enjoyment' which Moses renounced might have been, under other circumstances, perfectly legitimate. It *was* legitimate in the case of David and Solomon—the power and splendor of a throne. Moses could purchase them only by that apostasy from God in which the author (led partly, perhaps, by the peculiar circumstances of his readers) finds the essence of all sin (3:12, 13; 10:26); and called, as was Moses, to the deliverance of his enslaved countrymen, he could purchase this earthly rank and greatness only by turning his back on his calling, his people, and his God. He could have purchased it only by 'sin.' 'Sin,' here, is not the genitive of the object, but of the subject. It is not the enjoyment which consists in sin, but the enjoyment which would have arisen from sin.

26. Esteeming (*accounting*) **the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt**—which as sovereign of Egypt he would have enjoyed, but which would have brought to him less true happiness, and therefore less real wealth, than 'the reproach of Christ.' Of this brief phrase it is difficult to reach the exact meaning. Moses' choice had of course reference to the condition of the Israelites when he made it. They were suffering outrage, indignity, reproach. This Moses chose to suffer along with them. This 'reproach' and contumely endured by the people, into which Moses entered, was 'the reproach of Christ.' It is not, then, merely such reproach as Christ endured, or such reproach as his service imposes. The 'reproach,' the shame of the people, were the reproach, the shame of Christ, which Moses took upon himself in casting in his lot with the people of God. In what sense, then, were the wrongs and outrages inflicted on the chosen people the reproach of Christ? In a *typical* sense, says Hofmann, in that Israel in Egypt was a type of Christ in the flesh, and its bondage and sufferings, in its spiritual calling, as the predestined fountain of salvation, not merely in its natural relations, prefigured the indignities heaped on him in whom Israel's spiritual calling found its consummation. In a *mystical* sense, says Stier, in that the people of God in all times have a vital bond of union. The Old Testament believers were already members of the as yet unrevealed Head. In the *pre-existent presence* of Christ, as Logos in the Old Testament Israel, say De Wette and Tholuck; "the reproach which Moses took on himself is called the 'reproach of Christ,' as Paul calls the sufferings of Christians the sufferings of Christ—that is, Christ struggling and suffering in his church, as in his body. But this reproach is referred to him here, in view of the oneness of the Old and the New Testaments, and the Eternal Logos ruling in the former." Delitzsch unites all these ideas, with the added thought of a certain preparation for the incarnation and sufferings of Christ running through the history of ancient Israel, and thus finding it dimly pointed to in this ignominy and reproach of the people of God in Egypt.

A moment's survey of Moses' peculiar position may reconcile us to this complex conception. Beyond all preceding believers, Moses typified Christ. He was the Old Testament apostle, the commissioned one of God. He was the Old Testament deliverer, the rescuer of God's people from bondage. He was the human founder of the Old Testament household of God. And in all these capacities he was the direct antitype of our Lord. He wrote and prophesied of Christ. In him the Messianic promise arose on the world with a fullness and clearness which it had not assumed before. The typical character of the Old Testament history was deepening, and all the relations of Moses were pregnant with Messianic significance. In a sense, therefore, which could be attributed to none of his predecessors, the shame and reproach into which

27 By faith he forsook Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king: for he endured, as seeing him who is invisible.
28 Through faith he kept the passover, and the sprinkling of blood, lest he that destroyed the firstborn should touch them.

27 unto the recompense of reward. By faith he forsook Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king: for he en-
28 dured, as seeing him who is invisible. By faith he [1] kept the passover, and the sprinkling of the blood, that the destroyer of the firstborn should not touch

1 Or, *instituted*. Gr. *hath made*.

Moses entered were the shame and reproach of Christ.

27. By faith he forsook (*quitted*) **Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king.** Interpreters have widely differed on this passage, whether it refers to Moses' first leaving of Egypt for the Land of Midian, or his second and final quitting of it for Canaan. The early expositors generally referred it to the former; Calvin and many succeeding scholars (as Böhme, Bleek, Ebrard) to the latter; while Bengel, De Wette, Tholuck, Lünemann, Delitzsch, Moll, espouse the older view. It seems to me that the older view is almost certainly right. As to the relative importance of the two events, while the later one assumes the greater formal magnitude, yet really the flight into Midian was intrinsically not less significant, as decisive of Moses' whole subsequent career. It was pre-eminently in this that he turned his back on Egyptian royalty, and sealed his adherence to the fortunes of his people. It may have been this flight which declared his emphatic refusal to be called the son of a daughter of Pharaoh. The term applied to his leaving, *quitted, abandoned* (κατέλιπεν), though it might indeed be applied to the Exodus, seems here "to point to something personally and exclusively pertaining to Moses." Also the phrase "not fearing the wrath of the king" is, on the whole, I think, more favorable to this view. In the later Exodus there was no immediate question of the wrath of the king (though he did finally pursue with his army the retreating Israelites); but in his first withdrawal he fled directly from the wrath of the king. But this is no real impeachment of the author's accuracy. Moses fled from the wrath of the king, because he would not succumb to his will, and because he had chosen a course which defied his power. The immediate act of flight was (like his parents' hiding him when he was an infant) an act of prudent fear; the general decision and course which rendered that flight necessary was a practical defiance, in faith, of Egypt's sovereignty, and a turning of his back on all the greatness it could offer him. Moses' course in either of the two departures was determined and pursued in practical and open defiance of the wrath of the king;[1] but the language seems more especially applicable to the first, besides its chronological relation to the subsequently mentioned passover and crossing of the Red Sea.

For he endured, as seeing him (*the King*) **who is invisible.** As before he evinced that feature of faith which has confidence in hoped-for good, so here that element of it which believes in unseen realities. He could defy the sovereign whom he saw, because his believing eye was fixed on the Sovereign—such is evidently the ellipsis—whom he saw not, and whom none sees.[2] The unseen King was the King of kings.

28. Through faith he kept (Gr., *has made*) **the passover.** '*Made*' here, probably not *instituted*, but *performed, celebrated*, although the perfect tense *has made* may be used, with reference to the results of that celebration having continued down to the then present time—'he has performed that paschal rite which is the foundation of the permanent institution. **And the sprinkling** (*pouring forth*) **of blood**—the pouring or smearing of blood on the doorposts and thresholds. (Exod. 12 : 7, 22, et seq.) At this time the act was rather a sprinkling or smearing than strictly pouring, the language, perhaps, being drawn from later usage, when the blood was poured out at the foot of the altar. **Lest,** etc.—*that he who destroyed the first born might not touch them.* (Exod. 12 : 23.) Moses and the Israelites performed this paschal rite at the command of God, sprinkling the blood of the victim on the doorposts, and

[1] The faith of Moses lay in his decision, and its spiritual grounds. Having this faith and acting upon it, he would do whatever acts his choice thus made involved—to face Pharaoh, or to flee from him. When the time came to *face* him, God nerved him to do it.

[2] A like paradox and paranomasia, and in regard to a like subject (τὰ ἀόρατα καθορᾶται, there mediated by νοούμενα, see ver. 3) in Rom. 1 : 20; one of the occasional points of contact between two minds "wide as the poles asunder" in constitution and culture.

29 By faith they passed through the Red sea as by dry *land:* which the Egyptians assaying to do were drowned.
30 By faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they were compassed about seven days.
31 By faith the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace.
32 And what shall I more say? for the time would

29 them. By faith they passed through the Red sea as by dry land: which the Egyptians assaying to do
30 were swallowed up. By faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they had been compassed about for
31 seven days. By faith Rahab the harlot perished not with them that were disobedient, having received
32 the spies with peace. And what shall I more say?

eating with loins girded, shoes on their feet, and staff in hand. Thus there was a double symbol and a twofold exercise of faith. Their sprinkling the blood of the lamb as a security against the Destroying Angel marked their trust in God, who had instituted means in themselves so impotent for the result; and their eating the passover girded and equipped for travel, showed their confidence that the long-delayed hour of deliverance, in spite of the king of Egypt, had come at last.

29. By faith they passed through the Red Sea as by (*through*) **dry land.** The transition to the plural, 'Israelites,' is entirely natural. It is, of course, not affirmed that faith was individually exercised by all the vast company. The act as a whole was one which demanded, and was made in, faith. Nothing but miraculous power could cause the waters to retire, and open a safe passage for the multitude through the bared bosom of the sea. And as divine power could alone produce the result, so faith in, at least, the leader of Israel, was the condition of its exercise. When Moses was bid to stretch out his rod over the sea, had he unbelievingly refused, or unbelievingly performed the act, the result would not have followed. God opened the miracles of his power, as he does those of his grace, to the call of faith. The faith which moved the arm of Moses moved also the arm of Omnipotence. Nor need this fact stumble us, for the faith itself was an inspiration of the Almighty—was the first act of the miracle. The faith that upheld the walking, and the arm that sustained the sinking, Peter, were alike the Lord's. **Which the Egyptians,** etc.—*Of which the Egyptians, making trial, were swallowed up.* "Of which"; namely, either 'dry land' (ξηρᾶς scil. γῆς), or, 'sea' (θαλάσσης), with either of which the pronoun equally well agrees; or, possibly, 'crossing' (διαβάσεως, supplied from διαβαίνω), 'of which crossing or passage,' etc. 'Swallowed up,' a forcible metaphor from the verb '*to drink up*' (καταπίνω).

(*f*) Examples from the Exodus of Israel to the time of the Maccabees. (30–40.)

30. By faith the walls of Jericho fell, etc.—*being encompassed about seven days.* 'By faith,' of the people and priests, with Joshua at their head; not necessarily a vital faith in all, though the recent wonders must have made it well nigh universal. This faith led them to perform an act not having the slightest intrinsic power or tendency to accomplish the result; and God, in reward of their faith and obedience, miraculously accomplished it. Faith here, as elsewhere, implies, as conditions of the act and result, a quality in the actor. The inhering quality leading to the result is expressed elliptically by 'By faith the walls of Jericho fell.' The faith induced the compassing, which was the outward, as faith was the inward, condition of the overthrow.

31. By faith Rahab, the harlot, perished not with them that disobeyed. (Josh. 2:6; 7:22, seq.) Rahab had been, in her previous life, like Mary Magdalene, a disreputable woman; but she was a chosen vessel of mercy, and selected to be in the ancestral line of David and of Jesus; for the like reason, I think, with the selection of Ruth, the Moabitess, and of the son of Bathsheba, to foreshadow the broadness of the coming redemption. **When she had** (*having*) **received the spies with peace.** When the Israelitish spies entered Canaan, she received them hospitably, saved them from capture, and dismissed them in peace (Josh. 2:11); and this from no treachery to her country, but from a divinely wrought conviction, founded on the wonders God had wrought, that Jehovah was God in heaven and earth, and had given them the land. For this so remarkable faith, she perished not when her people (Josh. 6:21) were consigned to destruction.

32. And what, etc.—*And why do I speak further?* or, as many, '*And what shall I say farther?*' with little difference in the sense. The author finds it vain to attempt an enu-

fail me to tell of Gideon, and *of* Barak, and *of* Samson, and *of* Jephthah: *of* David also, and Samuel, and *of* the prophets:
33 Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions,
34 Quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens.

for the time will fail me if I tell of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah; of David and Samuel and the
33 prophets: who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped
34 the mouths of lions, quenched the power of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, from weakness were made strong, waxed mighty in war, turned to flight

meration of all the ancient heroes of faith. In fact, he has just reached the period of history when they swarm thickly upon him. **For the time would** (*will*) **fail me** *in recounting concerning Gideon, Barak, Samson*—three among the judges of Israel, Gideon put before the earlier, Barak, because, perhaps, a more notable example of faith. Barak needed to be spurred on by Deborah, but still exemplified, though not in the most striking manner, the Old Testament faith. Samson, too, displays in sacred history no specially elevated character; yet, chosen and raised up by God, he wrought deliverance for his country in his name. The humblest of these Hebrew believers still stood in bright contrast with the great ones of the Gentiles. Their standard of moral action was, in many points, low; but they had a *principle* of belief and trust in the living God which *tended* to the development of all virtue. That principle, as yet wrought but imperfectly through the limited bestowment of the Spirit, whose fuller effusion was to signalize a later age. **Of Jephthah; of David also, and Samuel, and of the prophets.** David again is put before Samuel, in order, probably, to bring the latter into connection with the prophets, of whose order he might be almost regarded as the founder. 'The prophets' are Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, etc., down through the long ages of the Old Testament history.

33. Who through faith subdued kingdoms—as Gideon the Canaanites, Jephthah the Ammonites, Samson the Philistines, David many kings and kingdoms. **Wrought righteousness**—either, as kings and judges and prophets executed righteousness and judgment for the people, or in their own persons performed acts of righteousness. Of Samuel and David, and of Elijah, Elisha, and Isaiah, and many of the later prophets, this was eminently true; some earlier ones, whose lives do not shine on the page of history, still, judged by the standard of their times, doubtless often exercised high virtues. **Obtained promises**—*Realized the fulfillment of promises.* This is true, doubtless, of many earlier heroes. God promised them success, and bestowed it in response to their faith. It is, perhaps, still more emphatically true of many later ones. Joel obtained the promise of the removal of the locusts and the drought; Isaiah, of the deliverance of Jerusalem by the annihilation of the hosts of Assyria; Daniel, of the end of the Chaldean captivity. And, as they obtained the promises, so they obtained their fulfillment. **Stopped** (*shut*) **the mouths of lions.** Samson and David both fought with lions and overcame them (Judg. 14:6; 1 Sam. 17:34-36); but the reference seems specially to Daniel in the lions' den, "Who shut the mouth of the lions" (Septuagint). (Dan. 6:18.)

34. Quenched the violence (*power*) **of fire.** Expressive; not merely the *flames*, but the *power*. Reference to the three youths who (Dan. 3:1-30), for their refusal to bow to the idol of Nebuchadnezzar, were thrown into a fiery furnace, and came forth without even the 'smell of fire on their garments.' **Escaped the edge of the sword**—as David that of Saul (1 Sam. 18:11), Elijah that of Jezebel, Elisha the encompassing hosts of Syria; Jeremiah, Baruch, Ebedmelech, Gedeliah, in Chaldean times. **Out of** (*from*) **weakness were made strong.** Samson was restored from his helplessness; David often was brought up from the depths of despair; Hezekiah, brought to the verge of the grave, had his life lengthened fifteen years. **Waxed** (*became*) **valiant in fight**—proved themselves *mighty in war*—Joshua, the judges, David, and many believing and victorious heroes in the time of the kings. **Turned,** etc., *to rout armies of foreigners.* Gideon, Jonathan, and many others. Perhaps, however (with Delitzsch), in several of these latter specifications, as 'escaped the edge of the sword,' and thence on, the author has in mind, along with the earlier acts, the times of the Maccabees: "The escape of Mattathias and his sons to the mountains, the trustful uprising of the small and increasing

35 Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection:
36 And others had trial of *cruel* mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment:
37 They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented;

35 armies of aliens. Women received their dead by a resurrection: and others were [1] tortured, not accepting [2] their deliverance; that they might obtain a
36 better resurrection: and others had trials of mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and im-
37 prisonment: they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, they were tempted, they were slain with the sword: they went about in sheepskins, in goat-

1 Or, *beaten to death*.....2 Gr. *the redemption.*

host, the first victories of Judas Maccabeus over Apollonius, Seron, etc., the formal victorious wars of the Hasmonæan heroes with the Syrians and neighboring nations. It has been alleged, indeed, that the mighty inspiration of the Maccabean period was rather human than divine, rather patriotically popular than theocratically national; but the Book of Daniel shows, in prophetic delineation of that time, a holy people of the Most High struggling with the impious, anti-Christian world-power, and claims for their struggles the greatest conceivable significance in the march of sacred history." Hence, Delitzsch regards these declarations as pointing specially to the Maccabean times.[1] This seems the more probable, as some of the immediately following examples seem, almost beyond doubt, to be taken from the Maccabees.

35. Women received their dead—*by a resurrection.* As the woman of Sarepta (1 Kings 17 : 17), her son restored by Elijah; that of the Shunamites (2 Kings 4 : 17) by Elisha. **And others were tortured** (*stretched on the wheel*), as the aged Eleazar and the seven brothers with their mother (2 Macc. 6 : 18-31 : 7, 8, seq.) tortured on the *tympanum*, a wheel-formed instrument of torture, on whose spokes the victims had their limbs extended, and were thus barbarously maltreated. **Not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection.** These Maccabean martyrs are probably placed in contrast with the women above named, whose faith serves but as a foil to that of the others. These women had faith which enabled them to receive their sons to earthly life by resurrection; the heroes of Maccabees had faith which enabled them, when their earthly life was offered them at the expense of their religion, to sacrifice it for a still better resurrection—a resurrection, not to their transitory earthly life, but of the glorified body, to life eternal. "The King of the world," said the second of the sons (2 Macc. 7 : 9), "will awaken us, dying on behalf of his laws, to a life eternal." It is an interesting question how far the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead had developed itself out of the hints of the Old Testament (as Dan. 12 : 2), so that our Saviour had not so much to announce the *fact* of the resurrection as *himself* as its author, and so that when he said to Martha, "Thy brother shall rise again," she was prepared from her antecedent teaching to reply: "I know that he shall rise in the resurrection, in the last day."

36. And others had (*received*) **trial of mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover** (*further*), **of bonds and imprisonment.** Still the heroes of the Maccabean times (1 Macc. 9 : 26; 2 Macc. 6 : 30; 7 : 37, in which the terms here used are found).

37. They were stoned. Zechariah, son of Jehoiada (2 Chron. 24 : 20-22), and, according to tradition, Jeremiah, the author turning back now to inspired history. **They were sawn asunder**—perhaps Isaiah, who is said to have experienced this fate from Manasseh. **Were tempted**—a declaration in this place, between the preceding and following verbs, unnatural and unaccountable. It is probably either a careless transcription and corruption of the preceding word ('sawn asunder, ἐπράσθησαν; 'tempted,' ἐπειράσθησαν), or a corruption of some word of kindred form (as ἐπρίσθησαν, or ἐπρήσθησαν, or ἐνεπρήσθησαν, *were burnt*). **They were slain with** (literally, *died by slaughter of*) **the sword.** The martyrdom of prophets was common in Israel, as by Ahab, Omri, etc. (1 Kings 19 : 10.) See in general Matt. 23 : 37: "O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee!" **They wandered** (*went*) **about in sheepskins**—more especially Elijah, who lived a wandering, solitary, almost savage

1 It is especially worthy of note that the words παρεμβολάς, ἀλλότριοι, are favorite words in the Maccabean records.

38 Of whom the world was not worthy: they wandered in deserts, and *in* mountains, and *in* dens and caves of the earth.
39 And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise:

38 skins; being destitute, afflicted, evil entreated, (of whom the world was not worthy), wandering in deserts and mountains and caves, and the holes of
39 the earth. And these all, having had witness borne to them through their faith, received not the promise,

life, clothed in sheepskins, and still more coarsely, **in goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented** (*maltreated*). The lives of Elijah and many of those prophets of God were a perpetual succession of destitution, of affliction, and of persecution and outrage.

38. Of whom the world was not worthy—a sort of abrupt and unexpected turn. Instead of saying, 'being deemed unworthy by the world,' which would naturally stand in connection with the world's rejection of them, he adds, as it were unexpectedly, the *real* fact that the world was not worthy of them. The world repudiated as unworthy of it those of whom itself was not worthy. **They wandered** (*wandering*) **in deserts, and in mountains, and in** *caves and clefts* **of the earth.** As persons of whom the world was not worthy, God withdrew them from the world to solitary sojourn. These statements were eminently true of the Maccabean times, when, alike for leaders and followers, deserts, mountains, and caves were common places of refuge; but the author has more probably in view the Old Testament prophets; as Elijah, who fled from the rage of Jezebel into a cave of Mount Horeb, and who, as well as his successor Elisha, frequented the solitudes of Carmel; the hundred prophets whom Obadiah concealed by fifties in two caves.

The author here breaks off his enumeration, but glances back for a general summary. All these persons received their attestation through faith; all obtained an honorable record. It will be seen at a glance that the cases are of the widest diversity, and there seems at first view almost an incongruity in bringing cases so utterly unlike as the heroic sacrifices of Abraham and Moses, the resolute endurance of the Maccabean martyrs, the life-long wanderings and self-exile of patriarchs and prophets, into connection with cases such as that of Jacob blessing the sons of Joseph, and Joseph in dying giving command concerning his bones, or Moses by faith celebrating the passover. But a deeper glance shows us that they are all perfectly congruous with each other and pertinent illustrations of the principle the author is exemplifying. That which he has undertaken to commemorate is *faith*—simple trust in invisible realities, in the being and declaration and veracity of God. To this single and specific object he is entirely faithful. It matters not what external form of development it assumes, whether that of active courage, of passive endurance, of sacrifice of the affections, of prophetic utterance on the couch, of a sacrificial offering. The simple point is the *trust in God* which the act exhibits; the rising above the domain of sense into that of spirit; the clear perception, the firm conviction of spiritual realities. This may be as fully evinced by a prophetic utterance of a dying patriarch as by the warrior going forth to encounter death. In fact, it may imply completer and purer faith by how much human and earthly elements are less likely to mingle with it. The courage which rushes into battle may derive part of its inspiration, even in the son of faith, from human impulses and passions; the courage that plunges out into the unknown future, that dares unhesitating to predict what, yet hidden in its womb, no sagacity can foresee and no human power bring about, is matter of pure and absolute faith. Thus faith is contemplated in its single character of restoring the sundered tie between the soul and God, of recognizing his being, promise, power, and veracity, and the more practical form which it assumes in legitimately working itself out, is of secondary importance.

39. And these all, having obtained (*though obtaining*) **a good report through faith**—the concessive participle (μαρτυρηθέντες), *though being attested*, emphatically placed. **Received not the** (*fulfillment of the*) **promise.** The promise certainly they received, and believed, but their faith was not rewarded with possession. Far down the ages they caught a glimpse of the glorious inheritance, but did not enter into it. Abraham, who received the promise that in his seed all nations should be blessed, and who rejoiced in a vision of the day of Christ, yet saw but dimly, and

40 God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.

40 God having [1] provided some better thing concerning us, that apart from us they should not be made perfect.

1 Or, *foreseen*.

went down to the grave in faith. Prophets and kings in long succession desired to see his day, but did not see it. The Desire of the nations, the Light that was to enlighten the nations and be the Glory of Israel, did not visit them. The more immediate reference is to the present life. They lived and died in the hope, but not the possession, of the spiritual blessings vouchsafed to the days of the manifested Messiah and of the Better Covenant.

40. God having provided (*providing*) **some better thing for** (*concerning*) **us.** God withheld from them his highest gift, and reserved it for us of the Spiritual Economy. This is put encouragingly and comfortingly, *as if* God looked down the ages and had such regard for us of the later time that he held back from them his richest gifts that they and we might enter into perfection together—a gracious and perfectly legitimate way of putting the simple truth that the purposes of God are developed gradually; that he does not bring humanity at a bound to the goal of its hopes and its destinies; and that the inheritance that former ages sighed for has come to us at last.

True, these blessings are in a measure future to us as well as to them. The Sabbath rest of God, the spiritual Canaan, the eternal inheritance, are ours also, still in hope. But with immense differences in degree. We have the image (εἰκών) where they had the shadow (σκιά) of the heavenly things. We have the manifested Saviour, the outpoured Spirit, the full revelation. John, the harbinger, amid the very breaking light of the new day, and more privileged than the greatest of the Old Economy, its Davids and Isaiahs, was inferior to the humblest of the New. The perfecting (τελείωσις) that was to come with the Messiah is still indeed in the future, but the perception of it is so clear and the foretaste so rich that, compared with what is given, almost nothing seems withheld.

That they without (*apart from*) **us** *may not be perfected.* They and we are together to enter perfection; together to enter the Sabbath rest of God, and sit down at the marriage supper of the Lamb. But as this is still in the future, have they as yet received no benefit from the death of Christ? Undoubtedly, they have. Whatever was their place and condition, they could not but await anxiously the development of the promises that had sustained and cheered them on earth. They could not be indifferent spectators of the grand drama of the Incarnation and the Crucifixion, of the Resurrection and the Ascension, nor fail to realize in their own immediate condition great results from those events. All Hades must have thrilled with the great fact of accomplished redemption; its gates sprang back on their hinges, and its righteous occupants rose into a hitherto unknown freedom and salvation. The boundary line between the saints of the two Dispensations was obliterated. Whatever blessedness belonged "henceforth" to the dead that died in the Lord, belonged equally to their Old Testament predecessors. It is among the prerogatives of Christian believers that they have come to the "heavenly Jerusalem, and to the spirits of the just made perfect." This must point to a different state of facts from what had existed before. Ancient men of God had died and gone into Sheol, to the spirits of the just, indeed, but not of the "just made perfect." Now, not absolutely indeed, they are still relatively perfected. All the privileges accorded to the New Testament believers are theirs. They are represented by the elders that in the vision of the Apocalypse encircle the throne of the Lamb. They dwell in the heaven of the Saints, and with all the believing dead will accompany the glorified Son of man in his Second Coming.

CHAPTER XII.

WHEREFORE, seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset *us*, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us,

1 Therefore let us also, seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, lay aside [1]every weight, and the sin which [2]doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that

1 Or, *all cumbrance*.....2 Or, *doth closely cling to us.* Or, *is admired of many.*

Ch. 12 : (3) *Renewed exhortation, suggested chiefly by this historical survey.* (12 : 1–29.)

(*a*) Incitement to endurance from the encompassing presence of this host of witnesses, and especially of Jesus, their Leader. (1–3.)

The preceding examples of faith have been intended, as they were eminently calculated, to inspire with fresh courage the wavering Hebrew believers. This grand procession of their believing ancestors, passing before their eyes, must have rekindled their expiring enthusiasm. The example of those old heroes and martyrs must have been as a trumpet call to the spiritual conflict. Alike what they did and what they suffered in behalf of the truth, and in confidence in unseen realities, might strengthen the feeble disciples. The apostle proceeds, however, to a direct personal application.

1. Wherefore, etc., *therefore* (emphatic deduction: τοιγαροῦν, elsewhere in the New Testament only in 1 Thess. 4 : 8) *let us also* (as well as they), *having encompassing us so great a cloud of witnesses.* The author now transfers his readers to a Grecian race course, along whose sides are grouped as spectators the whole long line of distinguished confessors and champions of the faith, whom he has just enumerated. Instead of coldly appealing to the memory and the reason, he by a magic sweep of his pen brings the whole body of them around his readers, and thus brings to bear upon them not only the force of their example, but of their ideal presence. They are exhorted to fidelity, not only by the remembrance of these illustrious heroes of faith, but also by the consciousness that they themselves are acting in the immediate presence and under the eye of the men who have wrought these deeds. Nor is this in mere figure. From their home in the clouds, from their heavenly rest, they are actually bending down to behold us. Witness (μάρτυς) is therefore to be taken here apparently in both senses; namely, that of witnesses to the faith, and witnesses, spectators of those who have now succeeded to their struggles. That the word will easily bear either signification is certain, and it seems hardly doubtful that by a sort of *usus pregnans* the author has them both in mind here. **Lay aside every weight** (ὄγκον, *bulk, inflating pride*); here, however, not probably taken in the latter ethical significance, as by Bengel, but every bulky encumbrance, everything that impedes the lightness and fleetness of our movements, as all burdens of Jewish and legal observances, all that obstructs the free spirit and action of the gospel. **And the sin which doth so easily beset us**—*the easily encompassing sin*—(εὐπερίστατον, easily standing round, readily encompassing and besetting our way) in the sense probably intended by the 'beset' of the Common Version; ready at any moment to spring upon us and arrest us in or draw us from our course. This seems, on the whole, the most natural and easy of all the manifold meanings which have been put upon this word. It is adapted to the figure of the runner who is able to be encompassed, clung to, set upon at every moment by sin, that lurks by his side or lies crouched in his path. 'Sin' is probably here as elsewhere in the Epistle conceived in the form of 'unbelief,' which shows itself in departing, falling away, from the living God. It was this unbelief and attendant disobedience by which sin deceived and slew our first parents, causing their apostasy from God; it was this, "the deceitfulness of sin," which destroyed the Israelites in the wilderness; it is the opposite of this which in the form of faith draws the soul back to God; and it is this malignant, deceitful, ever-active principle that the Christian athlete is to regard as specially impeding his course.[1] **And let us run,** etc., *let us in*

[1] Εὐπερίστατον (except in passages in Chrysostom referring to this Epistle) is found nowhere but here, and we are thrown back for its meaning on its etymology and the connection. From the active περιστάναι *to bring round, to transform,* it might be *easily transforming us,* but in no very appropriate sense. From middle

2 Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of *our* faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.

2 is set before us, looking unto Jesus the [1] author and perfecter of *our* faith, who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of

1 Or, *captain*.

patient endurance run the race (literally, *the struggle, the contest*) *that lies before us.*[1]

2. Looking unto, *looking away from ourselves, to the Leader and Perfecter of our faith, Jesus.* Not 'author and finisher,' as one that originally produces faith in us, and then brings it to perfection. 'Leader' (ἀρχηγός) is our Conductor, the one who has preceded us on the path of faith, the great Captain of our faith as he is the Captain of salvation. Keeping in view the author's definition of faith, confidence in anticipated and unseen good, and readiness to sacrifice all for this, the meaning becomes perfectly clear. Christ led the way for his people, he set the great example of this clear-sighted faith. In view of the promised reward, of the spiritual seed that was to be given him ("Thine they were and thou gavest them me," etc.: read the whole of John 17), he renounced the heavenly glory, he did not consider even his equality with God a thing to be violently seized upon (but rather, as it were, earned by sacrifice and suffering), and yielded himself up with unshrinking and unwavering fidelity to obedience, temptation, toil, and death. He thus is the Captain, the Pioneer, the great Leader of his people on this path of faith. And as he is the Leader in this career of faith, so he is its Perfecter. As he sets to his people the great example of faith, and puts them on the path, so he brings them to the goal. As he leads his people into the trials and conflicts of faith, so he leads them out into its victory and rewards. As he entered the perilous and toilsome path to be followed by his people, so he emerges from it into triumph and glory for a like result to them. Perfected himself, he becomes the Author of eternal salvation to all that obey him. He is the Perfecter of our faith as he leads it to the enjoyment of its objects. The two terms 'Leader' and 'Perfecter' are explained in the two following clauses.

Who for the joy that was set before him endured the (*a*) **cross, despising** (*disregarding*) **the shame.** Here, then, was the grand exemplification of that principle which Moses exemplified in an humbler way, of submitting to present sacrifice and suffering in view of future good. Christ submitted even to a *cross* (the absence of the article turns attention from the individual thing to the *kind*, such a thing as a cross), making light of the shame, and all in view, like Moses, of the recompense of reward, the joy that was proposed to him in the salvation of a purified and grateful people, and here, perhaps, more particularly in his exaltation at the right hand of God. The prospect of the reward bore him up in all his depths of agony. Some translate, "*instead* of the joy set before him"—that is, instead of the continued joy which lay before him as dwelling in the bosom of the Father; but this, although easily found in the words, is less in harmony with the writer's purpose. 'For' (ἀντί) is here 'in exchange for,' as 'a compensation for,' as 'the price of.' He was willing to pay the price of his humiliation and sufferings for the glory that was in reserve (2:9); "on account of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor." **And is set down** (*hath taken his seat*) **at the right hand of the throne of God.** This was the joy set before him, the reward and crown of his sufferings. In this he was 'perfected' himself, and in this too he became the Perfecter of the faith and hope of

περίστασθαι *to transform oneself*, it might be, as Matthäi explains here, *changeable, inconstant*, equivalent to εὐμετακίνητον: but this meaning also is here not very appropriate. The kindred words περίστατος, ἀπερίστατος, εὐκατάστατος, generally have a passive or middle signification, *surrounded*, or *standing round, well constituted, easily changed*, etc. Εὐπερίστατος, then, might be *easily stood around*, equivalent to *avoided, shunned*, and so here Chrysostom; or possibly, *easily, gladly stood around*, equivalent to *universally loved, prized*, as Er..esti: or (middle) *easily. standing round, encompassing*, and this either as a garment which clings to us and impedes our way, as De Wette, Lünemann, etc., or (as Valcknaer, Delitzsch, Ebrard,) *lurking round us*, ready to beset, entangle, ensnare us. This meaning we have adopted above, as on the whole most probable.

[1] The special ἀγών, however, here as in 1 Cor. 9:25, being the race (δρόμος). Τρέχειν δρόμον, 'to run a race,' would be more natural than τρέχειν ἀγῶνα; the latter, however, is not harsh; English, *to run in the contest.*

3 For consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds.
4 Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin.

3 God. For consider him who hath endured such gainsaying of sinners against [1] himself, that ye wax
4 not weary, fainting in your souls. Ye have not yet

1 Many ancient authorities read *themselves*.

his people. His exaltation had no selfish end, but stood inseparably coupled, as did his humiliation, with the exaltation of humanity. It is clear, then, why we should look away to him who, as the Leader of our faith, entered before and for us on his path of believing obedience and suffering, and as its Perfecter, perfected himself, has taken his seat at the right hand of God to give eternal redemption to all who follow in his path of faith and suffering.

3. For consider him that (*hath*) **endured such contradiction** (*gainsaying*) **of sinners against himself,** *that ye may not weary, fainting in your souls.* The construction is equivalent to, 'for considering him, ye will not faint,' etc., again equivalent to, 'considering the gainsaying of sinners which he endured, ye will not,' etc. The thought, however, receives depth and vitality from the personality of the Lord. It is not the abstract suffering, but the concrete sufferer that is to stimulate and sustain us. 'Gainsaying' 'contradiction' (ἀντιλογία) doubtless here stands as the representative (as taken by the Greek interpreters) of all the varied forms of opposition and hostility which our Lord encountered. The *word*, says Delitzsch, precedes and represents the act. Our Lord was charged as a revolutionist because he, as was alleged (John 19:12), "speaketh against Cæsar" (ἀντιλέγει τῷ Καίσαρι). He himself was to be (Luke 2:34) "a sign spoken against" (σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον), an expression evidently summing up all forms of hostility. In 'fainting,' 'becoming relaxed' (ἐκλυόμενοι), we have still the figure of the race.

(*b*) Their afflictions the fruits of God's chastening love. (4–11.)

4. Ye have not yet, *not yet have ye withstood* **unto blood,** *contending* **against sin.** There seems here a transition from running to boxing, as in 1 Cor. 9:24–27. "running (*so run I*) and boxing (*so box I*, not as Common Version 'so fight I') are coupled together." 'Sin' is here represented as an opponent in boxing, to whom resistance must be made, if necessary, even unto blood. In this, says Delitzsch, there is no charge upon them that they have not offered all needed resistance, but that the pressure of sin upon them has not yet been such as to demand the extreme of resistance: it is only implied that they have not yet been called to the supreme trial of faith. But does not the connection with what follows, "and ye have forgotten," imply a censure, and lead us to suppose that in this precisely the author blames them; namely, that they have *not* resisted unto blood, struggling against sin? Had he said: 'struggling against sinners,' the case would have been different. They could not be required to shed their blood under persecution until persecution arose. But in the contest with sin it is otherwise. They were bound to contend against it unto blood rather than yield; and as these Hebrew Christians *had* yielded, had allowed themselves to be driven to the very point of apostasy—the sin of sins—the presumption is that their failure to resist unto blood was charged on them as a crime. As a mere intimation of a privilege—of their exemption thus far from bloody persecution—the passage seems wholly out of place, and its connection with ver. 5 most unnatural. I therefore believe, with Lünemann, that the 'sin' which they had not as yet resisted unto blood was the internal temptation to apostasy: that the 'unto blood' is to be taken figuratively, marking their failure to make the extreme and desperate resistance which they ought against its might; and considering the immediate connection with our Lord, I think there is a reference to his bloody sweat in the Garden, in his agony of resistance to the violent assaults of temptation. This would give the passage a peculiar force and tenderness: but if we do not adopt this, there is at least no difficulty in taking the 'unto blood' figuratively of the utmost extremity of spiritual resistance: and indeed to mix up real bloodshed with figurative running and boxing is most unnatural. In every point of view it is better to take it figuratively: and hence all the questions about the Hebrews of Palestine, or Rome, or Alexandria, having or not having

5 And ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh unto you as unto children, My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him:
6 For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.
7 If ye endured chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not?

5 resisted unto blood, striving against sin: and ye have forgotten the exhortation, which reasoneth with you as with sons,
My son, regard not lightly the chastening of the Lord,
Nor faint when thou art reproved of him;
6 For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth,
And scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.
7 [1]It is for chastening that ye endure; God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is there whom

1 Or, *Endure unto chastening.*

suffered bloody persecution become quite irrelevant to this passage. It has to do with another matter, the Christian combatant's struggle against sin, even unto blood.

5. And ye have forgotten the exhortation *which holds converse with you as sons.* Many interpreters read this as a question; and even Delitzsch, while not formally, yet does so virtually. This is almost necessary, so long as we take the preceding verse as a mere declaration that the Hebrew Christians had not as yet *been called* to assert their fidelity by their blood; for the incongruousness of coupling this with a strong declaration of censure, 'and ye have forgotten,' is obvious. But, on the other hand, to connect it as a question with the preceding declaration, is intolerably harsh. The explanation above given removes all the difficulty. They have failed of that last and extreme resistance which they ought to have made to sin; they have allowed themselves to relax and faint (ἐκλύεσθαι); and have forgotten the exhortation, etc. All is easy and natural, both in thought and expression; and the thought suggested by the 'fainting, relaxing yourselves' (ἐκλυόμενοι), is naturally carried out; and, indeed, it is not improbable that the quotation following was suggested by its containing the word for 'nor faint, be relaxed' in soul when reproved (ἐκλύεσθαι). **My son, despise not** (*make not light of*) **the chastening of the Lord.** (Prov. 3 : 11, 12.) The declaration here made in Proverbs may point back to the Book of Job; at all events, we have in that book a striking example of paternal chastisement—chastisement outwardly severe, but intended in love, and working the fruits of righteousness, as it causes the virtues of a pious character to shine out with augmented lustre. **Chastening** (παιδεία) here, evidently, that form of discipline which consists in chastisement. To this chastisement these Christians had been more or less subject; that they had endured outward persecution is not denied nor improbable; but whatever it was, whether open persecution, or the seductive temptations of Judaism, and perhaps reproach, they had failed to meet it firmly, and very nearly given way to apostasy. This is clearly implied in ver. 12, which fully confirms our view. There is no need of the interrogative form, in order to soften the language; the author does not *intend* to soften it here more than elsewhere in the severe, and even terrible, rebukes scattered through the Epistle. **Nor faint** (ἐκλύου)—*relax thyself*, give up the tension of endeavor and struggle, and abandon all resistance; a clear allusion to ver. 3—**when thou art rebuked** (*corrected*, ἐλεγχόμενος), probed, sifted, convicted; and thus *shewn up to oneself*, commonly in classical Greek, by searching words and arguments; here, by searching providential inflictions.

6. For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth. Emphasis on 'loveth.' Chastisement is a mark of love. The withholding of corrective discipline marks abandonment of God. "He is joined to his idols; let him alone." **And scourgeth every son whom he receiveth** (*accepteth*)—as his own, in whom he has pleasure. The scourging is not the scourging of punishment, but of discipline; not the token of judicial wrath, but of correcting love. The author gently says that the Hebrews had *forgotten* so to take the discipline to which they had been subjected, and receiving it as if it came in wrath, not in love, had sunk under it. In stating plainly the fact, he yet displays his usual tenderness in treating leniently its cause. They had *forgotten* the exhortation.

7. Application of the preceding citation. **For if ye endure chastening.** Emphasis on 'chastening,' not on 'endure'—referring to *what* they endure, not the mode of enduring

8 But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons.
9 Furthermore, we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected *us*, and we gave *them* reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live?
10 For they verily for a few days chastened *us* after

8 *his* father chasteneth not? But if ye are without chastening, whereof all have been made partakers,
9 then are ye bastards, and not sons. Furthermore, we had the fathers of our flesh to chasten us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of [1]spirits, and live?
10 For they verily for a few days chastened *us* as

1 Or, *our spirits.*

it.[1] **God dealeth with you as with sons**—more exactly, '*As toward sons, God beareth himself toward you.*' **For what son is he whom the** (*a*) **father chasteneth not?**—that is, Who can be properly called a son whom a father, etc.? Others (as Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, Lünemann), "For what son is there whom a father chasteneth not?" with substantially the same sense, but the construction less forcible and less elegant. The article is designedly omitted, both with 'son' (*υἱός*) and 'father' (*πατήρ*). The sentiment is obvious. It assumes the fact that ours is a world of imperfection and sin, and the grand law that character is developed and virtues are born in trial. (1 Peter 1 : 6, 7; James 1 : 2, 3.)

8. But (or, *and*, *δέ*, slightly disjunctive) **if ye be without chastisement**—*of which all have become partakers;* which all the pious of former ages have been called to share, and in which their graces have been developed—**then** (*ἄρα*, *so then*, particle of inference; but, in the classics, never standing first, as here), as the logical consequence from the preceding—**are ye bastards, and not sons**—*illegitimate*, not genuine and acknowledged children. Ye lack one necessary condition and token of the filial character. In granting temporal, God withholds spiritual, prosperity. In leaving you to the full enjoyment of your portion here, he shows that he has no portion in reserve for you hereafter. The ore that is not worth refining is not worth preserving. See Luke 16 : 25, "Thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and similarly Lazarus evil things; and now he is comforted, but thou art tormented."

9. We have had fathers, etc.—*Then while the fathers of our flesh* (our fleshly fathers) *we had as chasteners, and gave them reverence, shall we not much rather be subject to the Father of our spirits, and live?* I take the 'then' (*εἶτα*), with the old commentators, as introducing a question of surprise and displeasure, as *then* is not infrequently used in English. *Then* did we do this, and shall we not do that? So the particle is familiarly used in the classics, and so may it naturally be in this Epistle, which in so many instances employs the elegant classical constructions.[2] God is here called the "Father of our spirits," as contrasted with "fathers of our flesh." The passage probably involves no special teaching respecting the origin of spirits. Physiologically, probably in the same sense in which man is father of the body he is father of the soul; our entire humanity descends by propagation. But man is the father of our flesh, as his discipline reaches mainly our outward and temporal interests. God is the Father of our spirits, as his care extends to, and his power quickens, our spiritual natures. The reasons, then, for acquiescing in and profiting by the discipline of our Heavenly Father, are incomparably stronger than those for a like submission to that of our fleshly parents. 'We had.' He is addressing men and women *once* subject to human parents, but subject to them no longer.

10. For they—*They indeed were chastening us for a few days*, 'with reference to' (*πρός*) a few days—the brief period of our earthly life; or, perhaps, only for the few days during which their discipline lasted (in which case we may, with Delitzsch, give to *πρός* a double reference to time and purpose, '*for* a few

[1] Many editors (as already Chrysostom) read *εἰς παιδείαν*, instead of *εἰ παιδείαν* = perhaps, endure for the purpose of discipline, endure in accordance with, and as matter of, discipline—but very harsh.

[2] To the objection that in that case the answering clause should have been *καὶ οὐ* or *οὐ δὲ πολὺ μᾶλλον*, "and shall we not much rather," it is sufficient to reply that the *μέν* (*εἶτα τοὺς μέν*) shows sufficiently that such a construction was actually in the writer's mind, but that he accidentally, or carelessly, abandoned it. We may properly construct *εἶτα* according to what was obviously the intended construction. The other rendering of *εἶτα* (*furthermore, in the next place*) may be the true one, but it is comparatively weak and inelegant.

their own pleasure; but he for *our* profit, that *we* might be partakers of his holiness.
11 Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless, afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby.
12 Wherefore lift up the hands which hang down, and the feeble knees;

seemed good to them: but he for *our* profit, that *we*
11 may be partakers of his holiness. All chastening seemeth for the present to be not joyous, but grievous: yet afterward it yieldeth peaceable fruit unto them that have been exercised thereby, *even*
12 *the fruit* of righteousness. Wherefore [1]lift up the

1 Gr. *make straight.*

days,' and, '*with reference to* a few days'). Thus their discipline is confined, *as such*, within the limits and interests of this earthly life. Except as coupled with and subordinate to divine discipline, it cannot reach beyond that. And it has another limitation: These earthly parents chastised us *according to their own pleasure*—better, 'according to that which seemed good to them.' Human discipline is, at best, in a measure, and especially as contrasted with the divine, arbitrary and capricious. Neither the knowledge nor the moral state of an earthly parent, regarded as an earthly parent,—and so soon as we regard him in a higher light, his discipline takes its sanction and coloring from the divine,—enables him to rise into pure and enlightened regard for the welfare of the child. More or less of earthly passion vitiates the best human chastisement.

But he for our profit, that we might be partakers (*partake*) **of his holiness.** These two clauses relate *chiastically* to the two preceding. They chastise at their pleasure, arbitrarily and capriciously; he purely for our profit, and with no alloy of evil passion. They, again, chastise us for our temporal, fleshly interests; he, that we may become partakers of his holiness, and thus may secure spiritual and eternal good. We need not, then, and ought not (with Lünemann) to refer 'for a few days' to both parents, our earthly and heavenly. The discipline of our earthly parents has respect, properly, to but a few days; it comprehends in itself no vital and permanent interests—that of God being designed to bring us to participate in his purity, has, thus, reference to our everlasting welfare.

11. Now no chastisement—literally, *all chastisement* (not, alike that of God and of man, of our heavenly and our earthly parents; the comparison with our earthly parents is finished, and the reference is exclusively to the discipline of our Heavenly Father. It refers to his chastisement in every form in which it may come) *seemeth, for the present indeed, to be matter not of joy, but of pain.* In itself, and, therefore, in its immediate consequences, chastisement is not agreeable, but painful. *Yet afterward* (in its ultimate effects) *it yieldeth* (ἀποδίδωσι, *renders back*, pays in requital, like the earth rendering back the rewards of tillage) *to them that have been disciplined by it.* Trained, disciplined (γεγυμνασμένοις) by exercise and conflict. The word the same as 5 : 14, "who have their perceptions exercised" or disciplined. Here, however, the discipline is of sterner character. There it is a discipline of exercise and use; here of struggle and conflict. And the fruit produced by this discipline is through the grace, and in accordance with the benevolent purpose, of God. **The peaceable**—*a peaceable fruit of righteousness.* It is 'a fruit of righteousness' through the gradual overcoming of evil, and the purification of the heart; a *peaceful* fruit, as against the struggles and griefs of the period of chastisement, and the still stormier commotion of the reign of sin. It produces early an incipient inward peace, and by-and-by, subduing every conflicting and disorderly element, brings one into perfect peace—"the peace of God, which passeth understanding."

(*c*) They are to resist firmly all relaxing tendencies by cultivating unity, purity, and constant watchfulness. (12-17.)

12. The preceding delineation of the nature and excellence of divine chastisement is in the author's highest style of elegance and dignity. The selection of words is remarkably felicitous, and the sentences are harmoniously balanced. It is a sort of 'rhetorical commonplace' on the nature of chastisement in the finest style of rhetoric, while it is perfectly clear, from its being so elaborately carried out, that the persons in mind had been heavily chastened, and from ver. 4, 5, and 12 that as yet this chastening had not wrought in them its legitimate effects. They had not nerved themselves up in the arena of conflict, but

13 And make straight paths for your feet, lest that which is lame be turned out of the way; but let it rather be healed.
14 Follow peace with all *men*, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord:

13 hands that hang down, and the palsied knees; and make straight paths for your feet, that that which is lame be not [1]turned out of the way, but rather be healed.
14 Follow after peace with all men, and the sanctification without which no man shall see the Lord:

1 Or, *put out of joint.*

suffered themselves to become faint, relaxed, exhausted. They needed this eloquent and forcible presentation of the nature and purpose of divine chastisement, and the forcible exhortation which follows.

Wherefore (in view of the fact that trial and discipline are but modes of parental love) **lift up the hands which hang down** (*have became enfeebled*), *and the knees that have become relaxed*—still carrying forward the figure of the race, or the agonistic struggle, and quoting freely from the lofty strains of Isaiah (35:3), whose language harmonizes with the elevated diction of the author. "The whole twelfth verse," says Delitzsch, "is a long-continued trumpet blast," and the elegant flow of the previous diction, and finally the lofty character of the quotation from Isaiah culminates in a fine dactylic line which very probably exemplifies the inspiration that spontaneously and almost unconsciously swells into the cadence of song.[1]

13. Rendered simply into plain English, it runs: **And make straight paths for your feet.** So better than "with your feet" (as by many commentators), as there is no special relation between the tracks of the feet and the straight or level paths, and this added clause becomes in fact a mere superfluity; for provided the paths be made straight, it can be of no sort of consequence *with what* they are made so. To make straight paths *for* their feet, on the other hand, is a thought entirely pertinent and natural, harmonizing perfectly with what follows.

Lest—*that what is lame may not be turned out of the way;* not 'dislocated,' or put completely out of joint (for which there is scarcely any authority in the word ἐκτραπῇ), but turned aside, turned out of its course; and thus 'that which is lame' (τὸ χωλόν) means not the lame part of the body, the lame limb, but, abstract for concrete, the lame person, the lame element in the church—the members who, deficient in spiritual vitality and strength, and enfeebled and corrupted by Judaistic influences, go haltingly in the Christian path. The church is exhorted to make straight and level courses for their feet, to remove every incumbrance that may lie along the spiritual race course that the lame and more halting may not be completely stopped and thrown out of their course. **But rather be healed**—that those inclined to Judaism may not be left to total apostasy, but rather cured of all their Judaizing tendencies, and brought once more fully into the path of Christian faith and duty. The 'halting' is doubtless mainly the wavering between Judaism and Christianity. The plain and straight path avoids all unnecessary turnings, elevations, depressions, roughnesses, everything which could easily ensnare a weak conscience or disturb an unsettled faith.

14. Follow (*follow after, pursue*) **peace with** (*among*) **all men**—here, not among all men indiscriminately, but among all the members of the church. The author's immediate anxiety is for the fidelity and steadfastness of the *church*, and for the avoidance of everything which may threaten it. He is too much absorbed in reclaiming the church from its incipient and threatened apostasy, to allow of

[1] Καὶ τροχιὰς ὀρθὰς ποιήσατε τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν. Imitated from Septuagint, Prov. 4:26. The more flexible German can here attain something of the stately elegance of the Greek. Delitzsch renders it:

"Und gradspürige Gleise bereitet für euere Füsse."

Böhme thus:

"Und für euere Füsse bereitet euch ebene Bahnen."

In simple English, "And make straight paths for your feet," the poetical rhythm, as well as the special elegance of the diction, is entirely lost. It might be rhythmically rendered:

"And for your feet prepare ye level pathways."

Nor does the poetical impulse immediately exhaust itself. Besides a certain poetical coloring over the whole, we have a little below two complete iambic trimeters:

Οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν κύριον
Ἐπισκοποῦντες μή τις ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ κ.τ.λ.

15 Looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble *you*, and thereby many be defiled;

15 looking carefully [1] lest *there be* any man that [2] falleth short of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble *you*, and thereby the

1 Or, *whether*.....2 Or, *falleth back from*.

his deviating into general directions regarding their Christian work and character. The first thing is to assure their Christianity, their Christian discipleship. Peace among all the members is to be sought by avoiding all impure and foreign elements, by removing every unnecessary ground of dissension and offense. **And holiness**—a consecrating of themselves to the Lord, sanctification—**without which no man shall see the Lord.**[1] Whether by 'the Lord' is intended here God or Christ seems difficult to decide. 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God,' would point to the one, while passages like "Ye shall die in your sins, and where I am ye cannot come," would indicate the possibility of the other. As to the essential thought, it is of course immaterial; as to see God is to see Christ, and the converse.

15. Looking diligently (watching, ἐπισκοποῦντες, overseeing, having watchful oversight, but with no reference to official action), giving careful heed and attention. **Lest any man** (*one*), *fall short of the grace of God.* Whether this is to be taken with the verb (μή) understood, as a complete construction, 'be falling short,' equivalent to 'fall short,' or as a participial clause, subject of *trouble* (ἐνοχλῇ), *harass*, with a broken construction, is doubtful. The latter (with Lünemann, De Wette, Delitzsch, etc.) seems preferable. The construction of the Greek (ὑστερῶν ἀπό), which (more than the mere ὑστερῶν) marks voluntary and guilty delinquency, leads to the impression that the writer already had it in his mind to put them on their guard, not against failing, coming short of the grace of God, but against the *pestilent influence* of persons who might stand aloof from, or fall willfully short of that grace. This, I think, is also pointed to in the verb to 'watch' (ἐπισκοπεῖν). I think, therefore, that the writer intended to write, 'lest any one, falling short,' etc., may harass you, or may prove a root of bitterness; but continuing the discourse by a reference to Deut. 29 : 18, was led to abandon his construction, and take it up, and, **lest**—I say—**any root of bitterness springing up trouble you.**[2] The passage in Deut. 29 : 18 reads, 'Lest there be among you a root springing up in gall and bitterness' (Septuagint, μή τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα ἄνω φύουσα ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ); English Version: 'Lest there be among you a root that beareth gall and wormwood.' The 'root of bitterness' in the Old Testament is a source of corruption, temptation, and apostasy; heathen men and women, dwelling among the Israelites, and alienating them from the worship of the living God. So here the 'root of bitterness' is a person 'failing of the grace of God,' with heart untouched by the spirit of Christian faith, and sowing among the disciples the seeds of doubt, heresy, and utter alienation from the doctrines of Christianity; a person who, like Esau in the family of Isaac, has no spiritual affinities with the children of the promise, and whose sensual mind will both itself be drawn away and draw away others from their Christian steadfastness. The danger of apostasy, and of the influences which seduce into apostasy, is apparent in the author's mind. The bitter and poisonous root, then, denotes here primarily persons, not doctrines or dispositions, as Antiochus Epiphanes is called 1 Macc. 1 : 10, 'a sinful root' (ῥίζα ἁμαρτωλός).

And thereby (*through it*) (*the*) **many** (οἱ πολλοί, Lachmann, Tischendorf; Textus Receptus, πολλοι, *many*) **be defiled.** "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." One poisonous plant may infect the whole atmosphere, and destroy many.

[1] Οὗ χωρίς for χωρὶς οὗ shows that the iambic rhythm is here not unintentional.

[2] Whether the ἐνοχλῇ, *trouble, harass*, was in the text of the Septuagint employed by the author is doubtful. The Alexandrian Codex, which he usually follows, has it, but so awkwardly introduced that it looks more like a correction from this passage (μή τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα πικρίας ἄνω φύουσα ἐνοχλῇ καὶ πικρία), in which the text has been clearly tampered with in an endeavor to unite incompatible readings. The use of ἐνοχλῇ may very probably, as suggested by Delitzsch, be occasioned by its affinity in sound to ἐν χολῇ, making a sort of verbal correspondence not unfamiliar to the New Testament.

16 Lest there *be* any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright.
17 For ye know how that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, i e was rejected: for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears.

16 many be defiled; [1]lest *there be* any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one mess of meat
17 sold his own birthright. For ye know that even when he afterward desired to inherit the blessing, he was [2]rejected; for he found no place for a change of mind *in his father*, though he sought it diligently with tears.

1 Or, *whether*.... .2 Or, *rejected* (*for he found no place of repentance*), *etc.* Or, *rejected; for* ... *of repentance, etc.*

16. An illustration of this defiling and poisoning root of bitterness is found in Esau, and his relations to the Abrahamic family. **Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau.** Whether fornicator (πόρνος) should be referred here as so commonly in the Old Testament (though rarely in the New) to spiritual whoring, going after strange gods, seems doubtful. The connection of the above quoted passage, which has reference to allurements to that idolatry which constitutes spiritual harlotry, as well as the natural requirements of the passage itself, would seem to point to this interpretation. The general absence of this use of the word in the New Testament is, on the other hand, though not decisively, against it. With Böhme, Tholuck, Ebrard, etc., I incline to the spiritual view, as it seems out of place to select literal fornication out of the whole catalogue of sins as one to be specially guarded against. The general drift of the passage certainly seems against it. Still either makes a not inapposite sense, and if the author had Esau in mind, his selection of traits may have been determined by the well-known or traditional character of Esau, whose marriage with a Canaanitish woman grieved his parents, and showed both his sensuality and his profaneness—that is, his willingness to sacrifice his high theocratic relations, as one of the chosen family and by birth an heir of promise, to worldly impulses and sensual desires. Esau contaminated himself and the pure stock of Abraham by intermixture with idolatries, and by encountering the temptations of such a connection. And again, in throwing away his birthright for relief from a paroxysm of hunger, he showed himself 'profane' (βέβηλος), not inspired with the spirit and principles of the Abrahamic family, not heeding the covenant relations which God had entered into with it, but ready to cast his lot with the sectaries of the world outside. His 'fornication' may have been spiritual or natural, as we may well suppose would accompany one of his violent fleshly appetites and unspiritual temper. Or very possibly, the word here may fluctuate between fleshly and spiritual fornication, each being intimately connected with the other. The case of Esau, then, is admirably in point as applied to those who, failing of the grace of God, sensual, out of sympathy with the spiritual nature and hopes of the gospel, may seek to draw back the disciples into the worldly elements of Judaism. In accordance with the general spirit of the Old Testament, Esau is presented here, not so much in his personal character as in his theocratic relations. In the gospel, however, the distinction between the two entirely ceases. Man is legally what he is personally.

Who for one morsel of meat (*a single meal*) **sold his birthright.** (Gen. 25:31.) Esau manifested his contempt for his birthright, and his indifference to the high spiritual blessings which belonged to the descendants of Abraham, by his readiness to barter away the prerogatives of the first born in that family. It is not necessary wholly to approve the conduct of Jacob; we certainly cannot but condemn that of Esau. He manifested, with whatever principles of native and merely worldly generosity, a total insensibility to the peculiar and extraordinary prerogatives of his house. With those prerogatives he could not have been unacquainted; he could not have been unaware of the extraordinary history and destination of his family. He was a 'profane' person, in that he voluntarily threw himself outside of the sphere of those high blessings wrapped up in the Abrahamic Covenant. And persons of corresponding character, unspiritual, sensual, unsusceptible to the pure truths of Christianity, were equally dangerous to the purity and steadfastness of the spiritual offspring of Abraham. Moral Esaus among them would be poisonous and bitter roots.

17. For ye know how that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected. His case is analogous,

intimates the writer, to that of those who have been admitted to the privileges and hopes of the gospel and have abandoned them. He had been heir to the blessings promised to Abraham, and had lightly esteemed and thrown them away. The case was then decided. He had no chance of recovering them; they were gone forever beyond his reach. His case was like that of those who had been once enlightened, and have fallen away; like that of the land, which, having drunk in the rains of heaven, and yielded but thorns and briers, receives no 'blessing,' but is reprobate, discarded (ἀδοκιμός), just as Esau was *reprobated* (ἀπεδοκιμάσθη). The verb means more than 'rejected'—it implies the *ground* of the rejection, and, consequently, its finality. He is *tried*, *proved* (δοκιμάζω), and is given up as not standing the trial, as worthless, reprobate (ἀδοκιμός). We have but a repetition, then, in another form, of the—in this Epistle—oft-repeated assertion of the hopeless condition of the apostate. He is to the church of Christ what Esau, after selling his birthright, was to temporal Israel. 'Rejected,' discarded—by whom? Some say, by God; others, by his father—more truly, by both, his father acting simply as the organ of the divine will. God had inspired Isaac's blessing of Jacob, and Isaac felt that, if he would, he could not revoke it. Esau's efforts, then, for recovering the lost blessing, were *necessarily* vain—**for he found no place of** (*for*) **repentance though he sought it carefully with tears.** It is commonly supposed that the repentance for which Esau found no place, was in his father. But this ignores both the construction and the connection. Had the author referred to the change in Isaac's mind, perspicuity required that he should say so, or give some hint of it. As it is, the language naturally refers the repentance to himself. And this harmonizes with the connection. The writer illustrates the case of the reprobate Christian by that of the reprobate Esau. But the former cannot be renewed to repentance. When fairly and completely backslidden, his case is hopeless, and there is no place for repentance. This character Esau symbolizes. He had turned his back on the theocratic blessing, and it were now but a mere platitude in the connection to say that he found no place for change in the mind of his father. *He found no place for repentance in himself;* no chance of undoing the mischief which his sensuality and unbelief had wrought; no chance of cherishing a repentance which should produce the legitimate fruits of repentance. He was *reprobated;* his error, and its results, were irretrievable. That Esau was absolutely and finally rejected in his personal relations to God; that he may not have so repented as to be personally accepted of him—I do not believe to be necessarily implied. His case is viewed in its typical aspect; he is presented to us in his theocratic relations. As Isaac's first born, the blessing promised to Abraham had naturally descended to him; and now, by his sensuality and unbelief, by his want of faith precisely in its double element of believing in the invisible and looking forward to the future, he had lost it for himself and his offspring irrecoverably. He found no place for an effectual repentance.

I have, with many (as the Revised Version, margin), put this clause in a parenthesis, and thus made the following, 'sought it with tears,' refer back to the 'blessing.' This is most natural in thought, and makes, at least, an equally easy and elegant construction, and a parenthetical construction of which this Epistle presents cases enough amply to justify the present.[1] I adopt this construction, however (with Delitzsch), not because I deem it strictly *necessary*, but simply much more easy and natural. It is more natural to say that Esau sought for the blessing with tears, than that he sought for repentance with tears. This latter construction I should not (with Delitzsch) reject as contrary to the historical fact, but simply as less natural. A writer might say that Esau, in seeking the blessing, sought for that repentance which should bring it back—that is, he sought the fruits of repentance, and thus might, in a sense, be said to seek for repentance itself. Still, the construc-

[1] How Moll can affirm that the assumption of such a parenthesis is against the genius of the Epistle I can scarcely comprehend—7 : 11, 19, 21; 10 : 8, 24 are ample to prove the contrary. I believe there are many cases in the New Testament where the assumption of a parenthesis will alone clear up the construction, as John 1 : 14. I take Rom. 9 : 3 (ηὐχόμην—χριστοῦ) as a case in which a parenthesis is almost certain, and essentially illuminates the passage.

18 For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest,
19 And the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which *voice* they that heard entreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more:
20 (For they could not endure that which was commanded, And if so much as a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned, or thrust through with a dart:
21 And so terrible was the sight, *that* Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake:)

18 For ye are not come unto [1] *a mount* that might be touched, and that burned with fire, and unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a
19 trumpet, and the voice of words; which *voice* they that heard intreated that no word more should be
20 spoken unto them: for they could not endure that which was enjoined, If even a beast touch the
21 mountain, it shall be stoned; and so fearful was the appearance, *that* Moses said, I exceedingly fear and

1 Or, *a palpable and kindled fire.*

tion is awkward, and it seems to me far simpler, and liable to no objection, to throw the clause, "he found no place," etc., into parenthesis, and refer back the 'it' (*αὐτην*) to 'blessing.' Thus all becomes easy.

(*d*) They are to hearken to these exhortations in view of the grandeur and exalted character of the New Covenant, and the danger of disregarding its blessings and claims. (18–29.)

We have here the final summing up of the whole exhortation, or rather, perhaps, of the whole preceding discussion, in one magnificent comparison and solemn appeal. The passage is in an almost epical strain of sublimity—it is a long, loud trumpet peal from Sinai re-echoed in softened notes from Sion, the heavenly Jerusalem, exhorting the readers by all the richer prerogatives of the New Covenant, and by all the sharper woes of spurning it, to Christian steadfastness and fidelity. As if the writer would bring into comparison that passage of the spiritual Israel into its Sabbath rest mentioned (3 : 8), with the desert sojourn of ancient Israel, he proceeds:

18. For ye are not come—*have not drawn near to a mountain that is handled;* that is, to an earthly, material mountain, which is palpable to sense; namely, Mount Sinai, before which ancient Israel was brought in the wilderness. **And that burned**—*and to kindled fire.* Most commentators take the participle (*κεκαυμένῳ*) as attributive of 'mount' (*ὄρει*)[1] 'and burning with fire'; but the position of 'mount' (*ὄρει*) is adverse to it, and Deut. 4 : 36 mentions the great fire separately. It seems more natural, therefore, to take it as above. **Nor unto blackness** (*cloud gloom*) **and darkness and tempest.** Such is the language in Deut. 41 : 11.

19. And the sound—*And to a blast of a trumpet* (Exod. 19 : 16)—**and the** (*a*) **voice of words** (Deut. 4 : 12, *φωνὴ ῥημάτων*) **which they that heard**—the Israelites at the foot of the mountains—**begged** (*παρητήσαντο*, begged off, *entreated against*) *that no further word should be spoken to them;* referring to Deut. 5 : 25, where the terrified people entreat that God may not speak further to them directly.

20. For they could not endure—*could not bear that which was enjoined.* "*If even a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned,*" cited from Exod. 19 : 12, 13, but not with verbal exactness.[2]

21. And—*so fearful was the appearance* (*spectacle*) **that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake** (*I am terrified and trembling!*). The punctuation of the passage here given,—I mean a pause after 'And,'—one imparting much elegance to the construction, is due to Beza. The language here attributed to Moses does not occur in the Old Testament narrative in this connection. But, subsequently, when on the mount he learned of the idolatry of the Israelites, he exclaimed, '*I am in terror!*' (*Ἔκφοβός*), and in Acts 7 : 32 it is said of him, when he saw the burning bush, that, *being filled with trembling, he did not venture to contemplate it* (*ἔντρομος δὲ γενόμενος οὐκ ἐτόλμα κατανοῆσαι*). Either, therefore, tradition put into the mouth of Moses this language at the time of God's descending (which seems not improbable), or the author combines different and scattered elements into one picture. It matters little, perhaps, which, though I confess I incline (against Delitzsch, Moll, etc.) to the former. Moses may at first have well shared the terror of the people. Verses 20, 21 are parenthetical, illustrating, in passing, the terrific majesty of the divine appearance.

[1] *Ὄρει*. rejected by Westcott and Hort, but retained by Tischendorf, and inserted in the Revised Version. I regard it as almost certainly genuine.

[2] "Or thrust through with a dart" (*ἢ βολίδι κατατοξευθήσεται*), read by Erasmus, and belonging to the Textus Receptus, is rejected by all critical editions, and greatly weakens and mars the passage.

22 But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels,
23 To the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect,

22 quake: but ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem,
23 [1] and to [2] innumerable hosts of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to

1 Or, *and to innumerable hosts, the general assembly of angels, and the church, etc*.....2 Gr. *myriads of angels.*

Thus ancient, temporal Israel came, in its journey, to a material, visible mountain, from which they were yet to stand at a distance, and behold and hear with terror the tokens of the Divine Presence. It was at once sensible and terrible, repelling from God rather than attracting toward him. The spiritual Israel, on its way to its Sabbath rest, has a different experience. The earthly seems to have disappeared, and the heavenly has opened. A spiritual world, the heavenly Sion and the heavenly Jerusalem, with God its King, angels and glorified spirits its inhabitants, Jesus, through whose mediation it is accessible, appears, at once infinitely higher in its prerogatives, and correspondingly more terrible in its penalties.

22, 23. But ye are come unto mount Sion—not the earthly Zion, the mountain of the city of David, but the heavenly Zion on which is the throne of God and his glorified Son: 'Yet have I set my king on Zion, the mountain of my holiness.' It is no mountain that can be touched, but spiritual. (Rev. 14:1.) John saw the Lamb standing on Mount Zion. It is the seat of the **city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem,** and thus at once the counterpart of the earthly Sinai, and the antitype of the earthly Zion. In this city, on this mountain, God has fixed his throne, and here the Son of David is to hold the seat and capital of his dominion and reign forever in glory over the spiritual Israel. The distinction which in the earthly city of David existed between Mount Zion and Mount Moriah, the more immediate locality of the temple, is now to be entirely done away, and palace and temple, king and great high priest will together fill with majesty and glory this heavenly city. In Rev. 21, this heavenly Jerusalem appears descending to earth to make earth again the scene of the consummated, as it has been of the nascent and growing, glories of the kingdom. **And to an innumerable company.** *And to myriad ones, a festal host of angels, and a congregation of firstborn ones, who are registered in heaven.* Such is, perhaps, the best construction of these difficult and disputed words. A festal, joyous company (πανήγυρις) of exulting angels, in full chorus of song and dance, jubilant before the throne. After angels, who, as ministering spirits, are subordinated to the heirs of salvation, come the heirs of salvation themselves, the congregation of the faithful, the church of the 'firstborn,' not the saints of the Old Testament, not the earliest believers or martyrs of the New, but the whole body of believers who are registered and enrolled in heaven, whose citizenship is there, and who as heirs of its prerogatives and glory are *firstborn* (πρωτότοκοι). The firstborn is, as such, the natural heir to the estate. Christians are *all* equally heirs · they are all firstborn; all enrolled and destined to the full prerogatives of heavenly citizenship. There seems a covert relation to the case of Esau. There the inheritance was confined to *one*. There could be but one temporal firstborn; here is a "congregation of firstborn ones." It is to this goodly fellowship of angels and saints that the New Testament Israel has come.[1]

And to God—*and as their judge, to the*

[1] I follow Delitzsch constructing this passage. Some construst:

'And to myriads of angels, a festal company, and to the church of the firstborn,' etc., in which the isolated position of 'a festal company' (πανήγυρις) seems awkward.

Others:

'And to myriads, a festal company of angels, and to the church,' etc., making 'a festal company' (πανηγύρις) an apposition with μυριάσιν, but again making 'myriads' (μυριάσιν) awkwardly solitary.

Others:

'And to myriads of angels, the festal company and church,' etc.; but then we miss the 'and' (καί) before 'a festal company' πανήγυρις, which we have with all the other members of the polysyndeton, and which it seems unaccountable should have been omitted. The above construction avoids all these difficulties and brings together the angels and the church into a union entirely corresponding to that in which they appear throughout the New Testament.

24 And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than *that of* Abel.

24 the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of a new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better [1] than *that of* Abel.

1 Or, *than Abel.*

God of all. They are come to this church universal, and with it to that God of all things, who will judge it—'the Lord shall judge his people'—who will vindicate its members against all their foes and persecutors, and on whose righteous fidelity they can rely with implicit confidence. As the God of all, more probably, of all things, he is *able* to execute that needed work of judgment for his church, always struggling, always suffering, always oppressed. Hence we see (with Delitzsch) why 'God' is introduced precisely here in the enumeration, and why in his character of Judge. **And to the spirits of just men** (*righteous ones*) **made perfect.** The righteous who have already gone to heaven, who have finished their testimony and sealed it, some by their blood, all by their death. These are perfected; they have reached the goal of their destiny and their striving. This includes alike the Old Testament saints who have since the death and resurrection of Christ entered into the glory of the New Testament believers, and all the New Covenant saints, who have died in the Lord. In a comparative sense these are all perfected, although it is yet true that a higher stage of glory, a more entire perfection awaits them with the resurrection of their bodies at the Second Coming.

24. And to Jesus the mediator of the (*a*) **new covenant**—and a covenant by so much better than the Old, as its Mediator and its High Priest, and its sanctions, are all higher than those of the Old. That Old Covenant was inadequate to secure obedience: it was necessary to replace it by a New; and to such a New one, and to its Mediator, Jesus, they have come. The author here is not thinking of the glorified and reigning Christ, but of the atoning and interceding Jesus; hence the name of tenderness, the name of the suffering, dying man, and the emphatic pre-position of that character under which and for the sake of which he is here mentioned. To a New Covenant, to a Mediator of that New Covenant, and to Jesus as that Mediator they have come. Following naturally on the 'Covenant' (διαθήκη) is the blood that consecrated it.

And to the blood of sprinkling (*to sprinkled blood*)—blood sprinkled upon the people of old in symbolical expiation, but since the great sacrifice sprinkled upon the heart in effectual cleansing from an evil conscience. Moses sprinkled the people with blood at the foot of the mount, at the receiving of the Law; signifying that cleansing and expiation could be made only with blood. **That speaketh better** (*more mightily*) **than** (*did*) **that of Abel.** This refers not to the blood of Abel's sacrifice, but his own blood which, sinking into the ground, called to God for vengeance. This vengeance cry which God heard and could not but hear, represented all the cry of outraged and unappeased justice which went up from our guilt-stained earth to God: a cry which could never be silenced or denied but by the mightier pleading of a better blood. That blood was shed by Christ. It not merely speaks better things then did Abel or the blood of Abel,—that follows from the different nature of the two sacrifices,—but it speaks more *mightily* than did Abel. The plea for mercy in the blood shed by the righteous victim of the New Covenant overpowers and swallows up the vengeance plea of the righteous victim of the earlier time. It speaks more mightily, and thus mercy rejoices against vengeance.

We have reached the end of the parallel. It will be observed that the author studiously omits the article in the second as in the first series of the antithesis. It is difficult to give the full force of this in English, but it is much more elegant and forcible in Greek. By omitting the article he designates not the particular things, as known, but the kind or class of things, as if now first spoken of. Ye have come to a mountain, Zion, to a city of the living God, to a festal company, to a congregation of first-born ones, to a Judge, the God of all, to spirits of righteous men perfected, etc.

Again, Delitzsch, with some others, finds not perhaps a strictly designed, but, after all, not an accidental correspondence in the number of members constituting the parallel, each containing the perfect number seven. On the one hand—(1) the material mountain, (2) the

25 See that ye refuse not him that speaketh: for if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more *shall not* we *escape*, if we turn away from him that *speaketh* from heaven:
26 Whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven.
27 And this *word*, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things

25 See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not, when they refused him that warned *them* on earth, much more *shall not* we *escape*, who turn away from him [1]that *warneth* from heaven: whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more will I make to tremble not the earth only, but also the heaven.
27 And this *word*, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things

1 Or, *that is from heaven.*

burning fire, (3) cloud gloom, (4) darkness, (5) tempest, (6) the trumpet blast, (7) voice of words. On the other—(1) Mount Zion, (2) the heavenly Jerusalem, (3) the myriad host of angels and believers, (4) God, the Judge, (5) the spirits of the perfected righteous, (6) the mediator Jesus, (7) the blood of sprinkling. Without attempting, with some, to carry out the antithesis, and place the different members one against each other, it is certain that with Mount Sinai is contrasted Mount Zion, and not improbably with the 'voice of words' which drove off the listening and affrighted multitudes, the still more loudly and mightily speaking blood of sprinkling. Thus the first and last members of the parallel, seem placed in designed, or certainly in real correspondence to each other.

25. See that ye refuse not, *beg off from, deprecatingly decline to hear* (παραιτήσησθε same as ver. 19, παρητήσαντο, *deprecated, begged off*), **him that speaketh** (λαλοῦντα, perhaps with reference to λαλοῦντι, just preceding, ver. 24)—that is, apparently God, who of old spoke through angels on Sinai, and now speaks through his Son from the heavenly Zion. God is ultimately the speaker in both cases (as see 1 : 1) then on earth, now from heaven. **For if they escaped not** out of reach, but were compelled to *abide the hearing, when they refused to hear* (παραιτησάμενοι) *him that warned them* (or, *uttered his oracles*) *on earth*, locally and in a limited manner, so that it was possible to withdraw from the sound of his voice, as also looking at the lessened dignity of one who spoke on earth. **Much more,** etc. *Much less shall we* [escape] *who turn away from him that speaketh from heaven.* If the endeavor to escape from the hearing of that limited, local, earthly utterance on the summit of Sinai was vain, how much more vain the endeavor to get out of the reach of that voice which is uttered from the heavens. God once spake on Sinai through his angels; he again speaks on earth through his Son. This latter is not now adverted to, but rather the voice which he now utters through his Son glorified and exalted at his right hand in the heavens. This voice from the heavenly Zion, to which the marching church has come, and at the foot of which she now, as it were, lies—this voice of God through the Mediator, promising where he once threatened, forgiving where he once condemned—this voice sent down to men, speaking of pardon and reconciliation, and eternal life, uttered from its exalted place, whence it can ring out over all the earth, exempted from those limitations of space and matter which circumscribed and hemmed in that, but from the opened heavens speaking into the spiritual ear of humanity,—this we cannot escape from. This voice, like a trumpet blast, echoes over all the world, and this calls up the thought of the final and grand scene in which that voice is yet more fully to reveal its power.

26. Whose voice then shook the earth—at the descent on Sinai were thunderings and lightnings and earthquake—**but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more** (*once for all*) **I shake not the earth only, but also heaven.** Cited from Haggai 2 : 6, from the Septuagint, referring to the future reign of the Messiah. One final concussion is to overthrow all things which can be overthrown, and leave only those inherently imperishable, to remain forever; because, of course, as there is to be no subsequent shaking, the things which *then* survive, are eternal. The kingdoms of the world, all that is purely temporal, will then be convulsed and buried in ruins; while the spiritual kingdom of Christ will emerge and stand unshaken.

27. And this word (*language*) **yet once more** (*once for all*) **signifieth the removing** (*the displacement*) **of those things that are shaken.** The 'once for all' implies that the world will be thrown down finally and forever; that there can be no need of any

that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain.
28 Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear:

that have been made, that those things which are
28 not shaken may remain. Wherefore, receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken, let us have [1] grace whereby we may offer service well-pleasing to God

1 Or, *thankfulness*.

renewed shaking, as the purpose of the shaking will be accomplished. But the purpose of the shaking can only be to test the durability and permanence of the elements subjected to it; and, of course, everything that can be shaken is shown to be void of permanence, and will be removed, to leave place for the permanent and everlasting. **As of things that are** (*have been*) **made**—and, of course, changeable and perishable. What has been made by hands can in like manner be destroyed. **That those things which cannot be** (*are not*) **shaken may remain.** It may be asked, how the removal of the things which are shaken can produce the permanency of those that are not shaken. *Their* abiding cannot be *caused* by the shaking and removal of the others. True, not strictly. But the shaking which shows the perishable to be perishable, and causes its removal, and which shows the imperishable to be imperishable, may be easily conceived as causing it to abide. That which tests and determines the abiding quality of an object it is easy to look upon as the cause of its abiding. Or we may easily take the expression as elliptical, 'in order that the things which are unshaken [and they only] may remain.' The transient is to give way to the permanent, the mutable to the immutable, the temporal to the eternal. Earth and heaven will be shaken and pass away. But a new heaven and a new earth, in which dwelleth righteousness, and connected with Christ's spiritual kingdom, will take their place and be forever. Delitzsch, with some others, constructs "as having been made, in order that the things which are not shaken may remain." They consider the use of 'made' (πεποιημένων), standing absolutely in the sense of 'formed, created,' without any complementary clause, as harsh and unwarrantable. It may, perhaps, be somewhat harsh; but is not, I think, liable to any serious objection; while, on the other hand, it seems not very easy to see in what sense the things which are shaken can be said to have been made, in order that those which are not shaken may remain. At least, it is a very harsh way of expressing the thought that the temporal and changeable are but images and types of the unchangeable and eternal, out of which these latter are to be developed, to say that the former have been made, in order that the latter may abide. Nor do I believe, with Delitzsch, that the declaration "this word yet once for all," signifies the removal of the things shaken, demands some such complementary expression as this. Rather, the language "yet once for all I shake," clearly implying that there is to be no further shaking, must naturally imply, therefore, that the proper purposes of shaking will be then accomplished; and, of course, we can, strictly speaking, see no object in shaking things, except for their removal. If they are to remain, and, of course, to relapse back into their previous condition, why shake them? A shaking which is declared to be final, *must*, then, unless it is an idle display of power, result in the removal of all that can be shaken. If it be said that the unremovable things, as the new heavens and the new earth, are also said to be 'made,' we may reply, True, this may be said in special instances, but, speaking generally, they belong to the category of spiritual and eternal things which are not conceived as being made. The natural rule is that that which has been made may be unmade.

28. Wherefore we receiving a kingdom that cannot be moved (*shaken*). This is here taken for granted. He has no occasion now to prove that the kingdom of God and of Christ is one of the things—or, rather, the one thing—which shall not be shaken. The old-world monarchies had passed away; the last of them, with the earth itself, was destined to pass away, and then (Dan. 7:18), 'The saints of the Most High would receive the kingdom (καὶ παραλήψονται τὴν βασιλείαν ἅγιοι ὑψίστου). This kingdom we are to receive not as a dominion or empire united under one Prince, of which we are to be subjects merely, but as a glorious dominion of which we are to be participants. Christians are represented not as subjects in a glorious kingdom, but *rulers* in a glorious

29 For our God *is* a consuming fire.

29 with [1] reverence and awe: for our God is a consuming fire.

CHAPTER XIII.

LET brotherly love continue.
2 Be not forgetful to entertain strangers: for thereby some have entertained angels unawares.

1 Let love of the brethren continue. Forget not to show love unto strangers: for thereby some have

1 Or, *godly fear.*

kingdom. *Let us cherish gratitude* is better here than **let us have grace** (which would require χάριν ἔχωμεν); *let us retain, hold on to grace* (would require κατέχωμεν χάριν). **Whereby** (*through which;* namely, gratitude) **we may serve God acceptably** (Codex Sinaiticus, λατρεύομεν, *we do serve*, etc.), as ministers or worshipers of God in his spiritual sanctuary, like those who took literal part in the ancient ritual; service, not merely in the general sense of rendering obedience—though obedience is, of course, the essence of the service—but with specific allusion to the service of the sanctuary—*with pious reverence and godly fear;* filial reverence (εὐλαβεία, 5 : 7), which will lovingly heed his transcendent greatness and authority; '*fear*' of the punishments that await disobedience.

29. For our God is (*also*) **a consuming fire.** A ground of the fear and devoutness which are the mark of our service. The thought is not, "for also *our* God, as well as the God of the Old Testament" (which would require (ἡμῶν ὁ θεός, or, still better, ὁ γὰρ ἡμέτερος θεός), but, "for also is our God"—that is, not only a God of grace and benignity, but also (καί) a consuming fire. He speaks in power as well as in love. He proffers grace and salvation, and bestows an everlasting kingdom; but he also destroys those who ungratefully and unbelievingly reject his proffers. Delitzsch supposes that the expression points to the double quality of fire—its power to illumine, as well as to burn; its benignant, as well as its wrathful nature. The language is cited from Deut. 4 : 24 (κύριος ὁ θεός σου πῦρ κατανάλισκον ἐστί, θεὸς ζηλώτης).

CONCLUSION. (13 : 1-25.)

For the first time in the entire Epistle the author's tone now relaxes. There has previously been almost no word, apparently, said that did not bear upon the one single purpose of rescuing his readers from incipient and threatened apostasy, of preserving them on the foundation of the gospel. There has been scarcely a single exhortation, or argument, that has not been directed to this end. The dreadful consequence of falling away from God has hitherto been the keynote of the entire Epistle. The tone now changes. Some general exhortations addressed to Christians as such, and on more general points of Christian duty, are now introduced. The author has done his work so elaborately, so thoroughly, that he can now afford to turn for a few moments to what may be termed the commonplaces of Christian exhortation, although so full is his mind of the one grand theme that he yet again returns to it before concluding his Epistle.

Ch. 13. (1) *Practical admonitions to various Christian duties.* (1-9.)

1. Let brotherly love continue. From 6 : 10; 10 : 33 it is clear that the Christians addressed had been formerly eminent for this virtue. From this passage, it is evident that, however weakened by the lowered tone of their Christian life, it still existed among them. In their Judaizing inclinations, they would be tempted to restrain their fraternal intercourse with Gentile Christians, and, indeed, with each other as disciples. Hence the special importance of reminding them to revive and cherish this grace, and also the putting first of the noun rather than of the verb is a delicate intimation that there was some slackening in this respect. He says, 'Let *brotherly love* continue'; not, 'Let brotherly love *continue*,' as if its present existence were no matter of doubt, and the only question was of its continuance.

2. Be not forgetful, etc. (*do not forget the entertainment of strangers*). This is one specific and very important form which brotherly love might assume. When the lines are as sharply drawn as between Jews and heathen, and between both and Christians, the latter being objects of common hatred, the enter-

3 Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them; *and* them which suffer adversity, as being yourselves also in the body.
4 Marriage *is* honourable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge.
5 *Let your* conversation *be* without covetousness; *and be* content with such things as ye have: for he hath said, I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee.

3 entertained angels unawares. Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them; them that are evil entreated, as being yourselves also in the body.
4 *Let* marriage *be* had in honour among all, and *let* the bed *be* undefiled: for fornicators and adulterers God
5 will judge. [1]Be ye free from the love of money; content with such things as ye have: for himself hath said, I will in no wise fail thee, neither will I

1 Gr. Let *your turn* of mind be *free.*

tainment of traveling Christians by their brethren would become an urgent duty, and upon Jewish Christians some cogent inducements to it might be drawn from their earlier annals. **For thereby some have entertained angels unawares.** Abraham, Lot, etc., would readily occur as illustrations of this statement. The pith of the thought is that in entertaining Christians in the name of Christ, we are *always* entertaining angels, or rather him who is exalted infinitely above the angels. "I was a stranger, and ye took me in." Hospitality to his people is recognized as hospitality to their King.

3. Remember (that is, with kindness and active aid) **them that are in bonds, as bound with them**—those who, for their fidelity to Christ, are subjects of persecution and imprisonment. This phenomenon was too common in the primitive church to justify us in making it any clue to the destination of the Epistle. The measure of their kindly remembrance is to be 'as bound with them,' as sharing their imprisonment. Enter into their bondage as if it were your own; bring it as near to your sympathies as if you were actual participants in it. "I was in prison, and ye came unto me." **Them which** (*who*) *suffer outrage*, **as being yourselves also in the body**—and consequently liable to the same abuse. The consciousness of being ourselves exposed to any particular form of suffering will enhance our sympathy for those who are already enduring it, especially when precisely the same causes exist in us which have brought indignity and outrage upon them. The appeal is not purely to our natural sympathies; it involves the idea that we may experience the same sufferings for the same cause. The distinction which Delitzsch draws between our sympathy in the two different cases as springing, the one from spiritual, the other from natural fellowship of suffering, seems scarcely tenable. We need not exclude the natural element from the former, nor the spiritual from the latter.

4. Marriage is, etc.—*Let marriage be in all things held in honor, and the bed undefiled.* That the passage is *in spirit* hortatory cannot be doubted. It is better, therefore, to render it so, I think, even though we may grant the actual supplying of the imperative (ἔστω) unwonted, and perhaps not strictly in the author's mind. The exhortation seems to strike at the incipient gnostic asceticism (1 Tim. 4:3) on the one hand, and on the other at the licentiousness which, while seemingly hostile, is really its natural accompaniment. Whether marriage is to be held in honor, and hence not disowned by a transcendental and spurious piety, or held in honor, and hence not violated by adulterous passion, might be doubtful. The latter might seem rather to harmonize with the connection, but the former, as observed above, seems also to have been in the writer's mind. And the two are closely allied; for when marriage as an institution is, *for any reason*, thought light of, it will soon be violated by lustful passions.[1] **But whoremongers** (*fornicators*) **and adulterers God will judge**—in a sense different from that in which he will 'judge his people'; he will judge the latter for vindication, the former for punishment. He will pronounce sentence upon and condemn them. 'God' (ὁ θεός) placed emphatically last.

5. Let your conversation—*Let your disposition be free from avarice, being contented with what ye have.* Free from that love of money which is a root of all evil (1 Tim. 6:10), and drowns men in destruction and perdition. 'What ye have' (τὰ παρόντα), *the present, existing things*, those which are present to us, with which we are to be content, without, however, relaxing our labor, and feeling an honest desire to better our condition. Man is false to

[1] Γάμος, elsewhere in the New Testament, *the marriage festival;* here, *the marriage relation.*

6 So that we may boldly say, The Lord *is* my helper,
and I will not fear what man shall do unto me.
7 Remember them which have the rule over you,
who have spoken unto you the word of God: whose
faith follow, considering the end of *their* conversation.
8 Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and
for ever.
9 Be not carried about with divers and strange doc-

6 in any wise forsake thee. So that with good courage
we say,
The Lord is my helper; I will not fear:
What shall man do unto me?
7 Remember them who had the rule over you, who
spake unto you the word of God; and considering
8 the issue of their [1]life, imitate their faith. Jesus
Christ *is* the same yesterday and to-day, *yea* and [2]for
9 ever. Be not carried away by divers and strange

1 Gr. *manner of life*.....2 Gr. *unto the ages*.

his reason if he does not acquiesce in the present; he is false to his aspirations and capacities if he does not seek for better in the future.

For he hath *himself* **said,** *I will not fail thee, nor will I abandon thee.* An excellent argument, but where has God said this? In various passages the Old Testament gives half of it. "I will not leave thee, nor neglect thee' (Josh. 1:5); 'I will not abandon thee' (Gen. 28:15); 'I will not abandon' (Isa. 41:17), are passages which express the idea, and the words in part, but not wholly. But on the other hand, Deut. 31:6 gives us almost exactly this language; namely, 'He will not leave thee, nor will he abandon thee,' but not as spoken by the Lord, but as spoken of the Lord through Moses. That, however, which God inspires his people to say of him may well be regarded as said by himself. There seems, therefore, no objection to taking this as substantially the direct utterance of God. The passage, transformed into the form which it assumes here, occurs also in Philo. It is not impossible that it has been modified a little from Deuteronomy as part of a liturgical service, and thence taken by our author. In any case, his statement is true, as that which God has inspired his servant to say regarding his relations to his people, he may be justly said to say himself. The same language, however, applied in the same way by Philo, may indicate that it had passed into current use in this form. For the sentiment, see Matt. 6:28: "And why take ye thought for raiment," etc.

6. So that we may boldly (*confidently*) **say, The Lord is my helper;** *and I shall not fear. What shall man do unto me?* From Ps. 118:6, one of the songs of praise of the Jewish festivals. The sentiment, generalized so as to indicate the sufficiency of God for us in all respects, and reminding the readers of God as a helper against the violence of man, prepares the way for the mention of those Christian leaders who have attested their fidelity by a violent death.

7. Remember *them that had the rule over you* (*your leaders*)—here, apparently, those who are dead—*which spake unto you the word of God.* 'To speak the word of God' (λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ), an expression used by Luke. (Acts 4:31; 8:25; 13:46.) *Considering* (*contemplating*) *the issue of their walk*—the end of their earthly life, which the author avoids designating directly by death, or the end of life, but the termination of their Christian walk (ἀναστροφή, as often elsewhere; see ἀναστρέφεσθαι, 10:33). The reference is perhaps chiefly, though not exclusively, to martyrs (as, if the readers lived in Palestine, Stephen, James the Apostle, James the brother of our Lord, etc.); at any rate, such as had crowned a Christian life with a happy and blessed death. *Imitate their faith,* and like them be faithful unto death.

8. Jesus Christ (*is*) **the same yesterday, and to day and forever.** Christ from his ascension is forever unchangeable; a practical truth referring, not to his eternal Sonship, but to his unchangeable nature as Redeemer and Head of the church. As such his claims upon his people are the same for every age. "The same obligation which lay on the martyrs to follow him with fidelity, even to death, rests on you," says the writer, "will rest on his people for all time; and the rewards also are sure and abiding." The absolute unchangeableness of the Head of the church suggests the permanent character of Christian obligation and reward. Hence, also, the following injunction.

9. Be not carried about (*led aside*) *by manifold and strange teachings.* Not probably, as understood by many, teachings or doctrines regarding the sacrificial rites and festivals of the law, and especially the passover, which, however, now superseded by the gospel, would still be hardly designated as

trines: *for it is* a good thing that the heart be established with grace; not with meats, wherein have not profited them that have been occupied therein.

10 We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle.

11 For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp.

teachings: for it is good that the heart be stablished by grace; not by meats, wherein they that 10 occupied themselves were not profited. We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat who 11 serve the tabernacle. For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the holy place by the high priest as an offering for sin, are burned without

1 Gr. walked.....2 Gr. through.

'manifold and strange doctrines.' These experiences point rather to subtle and casuistical innovations and in all probability to those precepts of a false and spurious asceticism, which in the later period of the Apostolic Epoch were already creeping into the church, and which, even earlier, required Paul to declare that the kingdom of God consists not in "meat and drink, but in righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit." (Rom. 14:17.) The allusions in Paul's Epistles to those casuistical and hair-splitting distinctions to the "ordinances and commandments of men," "Touch not, taste not, handle not" (Col. 2:21), to the rising up of false, corrupt teachers, who should "command to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving" (1 Tim. 4:2-4), show what symptoms of half Judaizing, half gnosticising heresies were already developing themselves in the church. And to these it seems in the highest degree probable (Tholuck, Ebrard, Delitzsch, Moll, etc.) that the writer alludes. **For it is a good** (*excellent*) **thing that the heart be established with** (*by*) **grace**—it is grace with which the heart should be grounded and confirmed in the Christian life. **Not with** (*by*) **meats** *by which they that were conversant with them were not profited.* They drew from these meats (βρώματα, *things eaten*, food) in which they sought an outward and ritual justification, no real profit. No outward ceremonies could avail: not the food which goes into a man, but the thoughts which issue from him, have power to defile or purify. Grace alone, working efficiently in the soul, can truly establish it in the Christian life.

(2. *Renewed exhortations against apostasy.* 10–21.)

10. We have an altar (emphasis on *have*, ἔχομεν)—'an altar,' not Christ himself; not that of the Lord's Supper (as Ebrard, etc.), but the cross on Golgotha, on which Christ was offered up. **Whereof** (*from which*) **they have no right** (*privilege*) **to eat who serve the tabernacle.** The mention of *meats* (βρώματα, suggests the old Levitical rites, the clean and unclean animals under the law, and thus prepares for the mention of that spiritual food which Christians are permitted to take from that victim which was offered upon the Christian altar. This victim was Christ; this altar was his cross. Of this food every Christian may and must eat; his flesh and his blood are the nourishment of his people.

11. For the bodies of those beasts (*animals*) **whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin** (*as an atonement for sin*) **are burned without the camp** (*encampment*). Of the sin offerings which were offered by the Jewish priests, Delitzsch enumerates several of which certain portions were allotted to the priests, as the he-goat brought by the prince, and the goat or sheep of the private person, etc. But from these the priests of the law were excluded, as the sin offering of the high priest for himself, that of the congregation in several cases of unwonted transgression, and especially the combined sacrifice of the high priest and the congregation on the great Day of Atonement. In these cases the blood of the victims was borne by the high priest into the sanctuary; in the last one, into the inner sanctuary: and the fattest pieces were consumed on the altar, and all the rest, instead of being, so far as might be, eaten by the priests, was carried without the camp into the desert, and there given to the flames. It is to the latter of these cases, probably, that reference is here especially made. The burning of the sacrificial animal is regarded as typical, and as the Jewish priest had no right to follow the victim that had been offered for sin out into the desert, so Christ, having been rejected from the walls of Jerusalem (answering to the ancient encampment), and having there died as a sin offering, those who still abide in the tabernacle, who still adhere to Judaism, have nothing to do with

12 Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate.
13 Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach.
14 For here have we no continuing city, but we seek one to come.
15 By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of *our* lips, giving thanks to his name.

12 the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people through his own blood, suffered
13 without the gate. Let us therefore go forth unto
14 him without the camp, bearing his reproach. For we have not here an abiding city, but we seek after
15 *the city* which is to come. Through him [1] then let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to his

1 Some ancient authorities omit *then*.

him, and no participation in him. As the priest who remained in the temple had no right to follow the victim without the pale of the encampment, and there feast on its flesh, so those who abide in Judaism, and who thus sanction and ratify the sentence of condemnation and anathema which expelled Christ from the city and made him a sin offering, have no privilege to follow him forth and partake the life-giving banquet of his flesh. Their adherence to Judaism cuts them off from this right. The propriety of the author's comparison may be easily traced. The blood borne by the high priest into the Holy of Holies symbolizes the high-priestly blood which Christ bears into the heavenly sanctuary; while the slaughter of the victim in the outer court, its being offered on the altar, and the final burning of the carcass beyond the precincts of the camp, all find their concentrated representation in the one offering on Golgotha. The richness of the antitype enables it to gather and express in itself the fullness of various types.

12. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with (*by*) his own blood, suffered without the gate. The 'wherefore' is, of course, not to be taken as if Jesus suffered in this way in order to conform to this symbol. In fact, the symbol was pre-adapted to the great fact which it was to illustrate. The 'wherefore' is really logical and elliptical, and is equivalent, perhaps, to this; "for which reason we may find in this a parallel to the case of our Lord," etc. As the sin offering of the day of atonement was finally carried without the camp to be burned, so Jesus suffered without the gate of the city of Jerusalem, which answers to the ancient Jewish encampment. And as that victim, in its sacrifice and burning, effected for the people a ceremonial cleansing, so the sacrificed body and the sprinkled blood of Jesus secures for his people a real purification.

13. Therefore—inasmuch as Jesus suffered without the gate, and inasmuch as we cannot share the rich benefits of his atoning death so long as we abide in the precincts of Judaism **—let us go forth to him without the camp** —let us quit the camp of Judaism, the service and the ritual by which so long as we abide we cannot share the benefits of his sacrifice, cannot feast upon that passover which has been slain for us, but which we continue to regard as an accursed thing; that camp, to remain in which is rejection of Christ, to go back to which is denial of Christ, and to go forth from which brings us into participation and union with Christ. **Bearing his reproach**—the reproach which we share in common with him, indignities heaped upon him, and which, borne by us, bring us into near relation to him. The reproach which we bear thus becomes his reproach. Of course, the reproach here has special reference to the reproaches and insults which they would suffer in turning their backs on Judaism. The writer thus turns back once more to that subject of which his mind and heart are full, the warning of his brethren against relapsing into Judaism. With this the next sentence beautifully connects itself.

14. For here have we—*For we have not here an abiding city, but we seek after that which is to be.* Why linger in the earthly Jerusalem? It is not our true and permanent residence. The Jerusalem which is above, which hath foundations, the city of the living God, the mother of us all—this is that which we seek, and the present Jerusalem, ther fore, shall not detain us. The language is, of course, symbolical. The earthly Jerusalem represents the Judaistic system, of which it had been so long the seat; the heavenly Jerusalem represents the freedom and spiritual blessings of the gospel. The capital of the Old Testament Theocracy is not the capital of that kingdom in which is our citizenship, and which is to remain unshaken.

15. By him therefore—*through him, then* (with a special emphasis on *him;* through him,

16 But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.
17 Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that *is* unprofitable for you.

16 name. But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.
17 Obey them who have the rule over you, and submit *to them:* for they watch in behalf of your souls, as they that shall give account; that they may do this with joy, and not with [1]grief: for this *were* unprofitable for you.

1 Gr. *groaning.*

as the great sacrifice and High Priest of the New Covenant, not through the rites of Judaism—*let us offer a sacrifice of praise to God* 'continually,' and not at distant intervals. 'A sacrifice of praise,' spiritual, however, and not an animal sacrifice, like the thank- or praise-offerings (θυσία αἰνέσεως, Lev. 7 : 12–15) of the Old Testament ritual. In the Psalms (116 : 17; 50 : 14) this praise- or thank-offering is the symbol of the gratitude of the heart and of the lips; and among the traditionary maxims of the synagogue (Delitzsch) is one that, 'In future all other sacrifices cease; but the sacrifice of praise (the thank-offering) ceases not.'

The author explains this sacrifice of praise, this spiritual thank-offering—*that is, the fruit of lips which make confession* (acknowledgment) *of his name.* Hosea 14 : 2 probably suggests the language here used, "And we will render to him in return the fruit of our lips" (Septuagint, καὶ ἀνταποδώσομεν κάρπον χειλέων ἡμῶν). The fruit of the lips means the words, which have their roots, so to speak, in the heart, which spring up and germinate in thoughts, as the branches, and burst forth through the lips in words, as the flowers and fruits.

But along with our sacrifices of praise, the utterance of our lips, we must render other offerings also; namely, beneficence and liberality.

16. But to do good, etc.—*But doing good and communicating, forget not.* "I will have mercy;" that is, I desire the exercise of mercy, says God, "and not sacrifice." The sacrifices of God are a broken and a contrite heart and penitent feelings, expressing themselves in acts of love and beneficence. **For with such sacrifices God is well pleased.** The blood of victims is valued by him only as an act of obedience and as a symbol; beneficence and mercy are intrinsically excellent, and always well pleasing.

17. Obey them, etc.—*Yield obedience to those who lead you, and be submissive* (submit) *to them.* The rulers of the church or churches addressed probably stood firm in the faith, and very possibly deplored the symptoms of half-heartedness and apostasy which disclosed themselves in their brethren. It is not, however, necessary to assume anything in regard to the character of these particular spiritual leaders. Submission to spiritual as to temporal authority; respect and deference to age and authority—were the general duties enjoined on the New Testament churches; and the present injunction may only be in the spirit of that general obligation. They were exhorted to *obey* (πείθεσθε), and to *concede,* yield to them, even when their requirements may cross their own views or feelings. **For they** ('they'—emphatic, αὐτοί—they are the ones who, they as a class; thus not designating so much the character of the individual leaders, but the obligations and functions of the office) **watch**—exercise sleepless vigilance (ἀγρυπνοῦσι)—**for** (*on behalf of*) **your souls**—for their well being and salvation; *as having to render in an account.* The classical phrase (λόγον ἀποδοῦναι), to render a reason, or render an account of one's opinions or one's conduct. When the Great Shepherd shall appear, these under shepherds will be expected and required to render to him an account of the flock committed to their charge.

That they may do it, etc.—*In order that with joy they may do this and not grieving.* This 'in order that' assigns a motive for their obedience; namely, that they may (not render their account, but) exercise their watchful care—for to this the 'do this' refers; 'with joy'—that is, in view of the success of their ministry, and not sighing over its unfruitfulness. Disobedience and refractoriness on the part of the church, would tend to frustrate all the faithful labors and watchcare of their spiritual overseers. *For this is unprofitable for you*—that is, changing the negative into the positive idea; *injurious.* productive of evil. The ex-

18 Pray for us: for we trust we have a good conscience, in all things willing to live honestly.
19 But I beseech *you* the rather to do this, that I may be restored to you the sooner.
20 Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant,

18 Pray for us: for we are persuaded that we have a good conscience, desiring to live honourably in all
19 things. And I exhort *you* the more exceedingly to do this, that I may be restored to you the sooner.
20 Now the God of peace, who brought again from the dead the great shepherd of the sheep [1] with the

1 Or, *by*. Gr. *in*.

pression is a *litotes*, designedly saying less than is meant.

18. Pray for us. Whether the author here uses the plural for the singular (Bleek, Lünemann, etc.), or includes with himself his fellow laborers among the Hebrew Christians, it is not easy to decide. Perhaps the latter is more probable. **For we trust we have a good conscience.** On this ground he can confidently ask for their prayers; as, knowing that they have honest and upright purposes in the sight of God, they furnish the moral conditions required for hoping for the divine blessing, and under which the prayers of the saints for them may prove effectual. A hypocrite cannot otherwise than hypocritically ask others to pray for him. The 'trusting' that we have a good conscience is the language of that proper self-distrust, which, aware of the deceitfulness of the heart, will not take its own moral consciousness as final and positive proof of rectitude. 'We *trust* we have a good conscience.' God *may* judge us more deeply and correctly. **In all things willing** (*wishing*) **to live honestly** (*conduct ourselves honorably*). The natural emphasis on 'wishing' (θέλοντες) implies a certain modest spirit of self-defense, as if he and his fellow-laborers had to encounter suspicion and reproach on the part of the Hebrew churches. 'We *trust*,' says he, 'we have a good conscience'—it is our wish in all things to deport ourselves honorably. Imperfect as may be our action, we have, at least, upright and honorable aims. The specific idea may be that they have no desire to trample on Jewish prejudices, to break away from Jewish restraints, but to proceed in all things, as between Jews and Gentiles, with caution and due consideration.

19. But I beseech you the rather (*the more abundantly* — more earnestly) **to do this**; namely, to pray for us; and, more especially, of course, for me—**that I may be** *the more quickly* **restored to you.** From this some have inferred that the author was now in prison, though by no means with certainty. Innumerable other hindrances besides this may have demanded their prayers; and were he in prison, we might naturally expect (though this, also, in the great brevity of personal reference, is by no means certain) that he would be more explicit regarding it. The most which we can infer with confidence, is that the writer has stood in important, and still stood in kindly relations, to the church or churches addressed; that he was consciously a person of consideration among them, and was either expecting or expected to rejoin them at some distant period. On the whole, the allusion is too slight and vague to furnish any satisfactory clue, either to the author or to the recipients of the Epistle.

20, 21. A beautiful and magnincent form of benediction: one whose exceeding solemnity might suggest the idea that the author regarded himself as near his departure from earth.

Now (*and may*) **the God of peace**—appropriately so designated with reference to his desire that they may be delivered from the turmoil and conflicts of false doctrine, and be established in the calm and peaceful faith and doctrines of the gospel—**who brought again** (*back*) **from the dead the Great Shepherd of the sheep,** and as he thus dissolved the bands of death to bring up the Great Shepherd and restore him to his church, can rend asunder any bands which hold the under shepherds away from their folds. (1) Here only in the Epistle the writer alludes to the resurrection of the Lord. Elsewhere his view has alternated between his humiliation in the flesh, and atoning sacrifice on the cross, and his heavenly exaltation and high priesthood in the upper sanctuary. Here the fact of the resurrection comes in naturally and beautifully between these two, and completes the recognition in the Epistle of all the grand epochs or periods in the Redeemer's life; his pre-existent, eternal Sonship, his creative agency, his incarnation, his suffering life, his death, his resurrec-

21 Make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom *be* glory for ever and ever. Amen.
22 And I beseech you, brethren, suffer the word of exhortation: for I have written a letter unto you in few words.

blood of an eternal covenant, *even* our Lord Jesus,
21 make you perfect in every good [1] thing to do his will, working in [2] us that which is well-pleasing in his sight through Jesus Christ; to whom *be* the glory [3] for ever and ever. Amen.
22 But I exhort you, brethren, bear with the word of exhortation: for I have written unto you in few

1 Many ancient authorities read *work*.....2 Many ancient authorities read *you*.....3 Gr. *unto the ages of the ages.*

tion and ascension (for really both of these are contained in the bringing back, ἀναγαγών), and his glorification. (2) The expression here may perhaps be referred back to Isa. 63 : 11: "Where is he who brought up out of the sea the shepherd of the sheep?" (Septuagint, ποῦ ὁ ἀναβιβάσας ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων.) As Moses, then, the shepherd of the flock of Israel, was brought up out of the Red Sea, so Christ, the Great Shepherd, is brought up out from the dead. (3) The clause also reminds the readers of the one Shepherd, from whose fold they are not to stray.

Through (*in*) **the blood of the** (*an*) **everlasting covenant.** Whether this is dependent on the participle 'brought back' (ἀναγαγών), or the adjective 'great' (μέγας), and thus whether it declares that Christ was brought back in the blood, etc., or is a Great Shepherd in the blood, is a point on which expositors are divided. Each is grammatically possible, and each is unexceptionable in sense. It was 'in' (here equivalent to, by virtue of, so better than 'with,' Calvin, Bleek, etc., 'in' as denoting *accompaniment*), the blood of an eternal covenant, that Christ became a spiritual Head and and the Shepherd of his people: it was in virtue of that same blood that God brought him back from among the dead. I scarcely see a ground of deciding between them. Our Lord Jesus—Jesus is his name as dying, or as ascending and rejoicing. The one is the designation of affection, the other of reverence. The one points to his love in dying for his people, the other to his power to protect and glorify them.

Make you perfect [1] **in every good work,** *in order that ye may do his will.* The doing of God's will is dependent on his fashioning and perfecting them in every good work. God works in advance of man. As he chooses his people before they choose him, so he must work in them the work of faith with power, before they will work to do his will. **Working** (*accomplishing*) **in you that which is well pleasing in his sight through Jesus Christ**—transforming your natures, bestowing on you those gifts of his grace which work renovation in your hearts, and this through Jesus Christ, through whom all spiritual influences are bestowed, and all sanctifying work wrought.

To whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen. To whom; namely, to Christ the subject immediately preceding; or to God the principal subject of the entire period? Either reference is grammatical, either would be in accordance with the doctrine of the Epistle, as of the entire New Testament. "To him who loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." The sentence, however, is certainly better rounded and more complete in its rhetorical structure if the thought returns at the close to its original starting point, and if making a somewhat fuller pause after Christ, we refer the 'to whom,' back to 'God.'

(3) *Final injunctions, personal references and salutations.* (22-25.)

22. And I beseech you, brethren, suffer (*bear with*) **the word of exhortation.** This is the second instance (see ver. 19) of the author's use of the first person singular in the entire Epistle. This is so totally at variance with the universal character of the acknowledged Pauline epistles, that of itself it goes far to decide against the Pauline authorship of this. It is difficult to conceive how that full, overflowing, impetuous nature, everywhere else breathing out so lavishly and warmly its individual feelings and sentiments, could here have put upon them so strict a rein. The reference here is undoubtedly, not merely to the more strictly hortatory parts of the Epistle, but to the entire discussion, which is itself one grand exhortation. The Epistle has a strictly practical purpose throughout. Its argument is closely interwoven with its admonitions, and all alike are intended to rescue its readers from impending apostasy. For the phrase 'word of exhortation,' see Acts 13 : 15. **For I have written**—*for also with brevity have I writ-*

[1] Καταρτίζω *to frame, construct, fit, fashion.*

23 Know ye that *our* brother Timothy is set at liberty; with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you.
24 Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints. They of Italy salute you.
25 Grace *be* with you all. Amen.
¶ Written to the Hebrews from Italy by Timothy.

23 words. Know ye that our brother Timothy hath been set at liberty; with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you.
24 Salute all them who have the rule over you, and all the saints. [1]They of Italy salute you.
25 Grace be with you all. Amen.

1 Or, *The* brethren *from*.

ten to you. 'For also' (καὶ γάρ) designating here perhaps an additional reason, besides the weighty intrinsic considerations, why they should favorably receive his Epistle. "Much as I had to say I have written with all possible brevity; I have condensed my matter, in order not to be burdensome, into the smallest possible compass." None can read this Epistle carefully without being sensible of the entire justness of this statement. Considering the number and magnitude of the topics treated, it is a marvel of brevity and condensation. This of itself, placed alongside of the diffusiveness of the post-apostolic writers, indicates the inspiration of the Epistle. Nothing can exceed its pregnant and most suggestive conciseness. Every clause might be expanded into a chapter, every chapter into a volume.

23. Know ye that our brother Timothy is (*hath been*) **set at liberty.** Some, instead of 'know,' render as indicative, 'ye know,' but probably incorrectly. De Wette urges that if it were imperative, the author, wishing to give information, would have been more explicit; but this is pure conjecture. He might only wish to say exactly this, assuming that what else might appertain to the matter was either already known, or soon would be, as he anticipates a speedy visit to them, both of Timothy and himself. 'Hath been set at liberty.' From this we may infer that Timothy had been probably imprisoned, though of this we elsewhere know nothing. If this imprisonment was at Rome, then the writer of this could scarcely be at Rome, unless we take the 'if he come quickly,' of Timothy's coming to them (which, indeed, I think very possible) rather than of his coming to him. It would seem to mark an epoch in the life of Timothy later than any of Paul's epistles, and therefore, I think, after the death of the great apostle. If, as Alford supposes, the Epistle was sent to Jewish Christians in Rome, then Timothy could not have been imprisoned there.

Some render, instead of 'set at liberty' (ἀπολελυμένον), 'sent away,' 'despatched'—as Luke uses the word (Acts 13:3; 15:30), of official sending forth—that is, either with this letter to you, or elsewhere; and in accordance with this supposition is the traditionary subscription of the letter, "Written to the Hebrews from Italy through Timothy." As the word will bear this meaning, then, on the supposition that Timothy had not been imprisoned, and that he had now gone as the bearer of this Epistle, the word would be its own interpreter, and nothing more would be needed. If Timothy was sent in any other direction, something would seem necessary to be added, in order to make its import clear. Under these circumstances, while 'set at liberty' is the more natural rendering, yet it seems impossible to arrive at any certain conclusion. That, however, Timothy could not have been now sent with this Epistle to them, seems to follow from the next. **With whom, if he come shortly** (*quickly*), **I will see you.** This certainly would seem unnatural, though not impossible, to be said, in case Timothy was now gone on a mission to the churches with this Epistle. It therefore much more probably refers to an imprisonment from which Timothy had now been released, and in consequence of which, coming to the writer, they were together to visit these Christians. I think, therefore, that the evidence, slight as it is, tends to show that the Epistle is post-Pauline. Nothing more, however, and not even that can with certainty be drawn from it. The 'if he shall come very quickly,' is, probably, 'if he come to me,' and not, 'if he come to you'; and yet this latter is very possible. But in either case, how the speediness of Timothy's coming was to affect the movements of the author, remains entirely in the dark.

24. Salute all them that have the rule over (*lead of*) **you, and all the saints**—alike officers of the church and private brethren; the whole body of Christians with whom they might stand in any connection. **They of** (*from*) **Italy salute you.** This phrase again fails to give any decisive clue to the

locality either of the writer or receivers of the Epistle. The phrase 'those from Italy' (οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας) most naturally denotes those who belong to a certain place or country, but are now distant from it, as "the Jews from Asia" — οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἰουδαῖοι (Acts 21 : 27)— namely, the Jews who belonged to, and came from, Asia. It may, however, be equivalent to 'those who belong to Italy' (οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἰταλίας) and dwell there; as Acts 17 : 12, "those of Thessalonica" (οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης). Thus, then, here the phrase would most naturally mean, judged simply by itself, 'those from Italy,' who are in another country; and this would mark the locality of the writer as out of Italy, and the probable destination of the Epistle as to Italian Christians, to whom their distant countrymen send greeting. But it may also denote those that belong to Italy and dwell there; and thus mark the writer as now dwelling in Rome, or some other part of Italy, and sending their greetings to churches elsewhere. Thus the utmost that it certainly proves is that either the writer of the Epistle was in Italy, or its recipients were; and judging the phrase simply by itself, the latter would be the more probable; but if it could be made out with any certainty that it was addressed to Christians in Palestine or elsewhere, then it would be pretty clear that the Epistle originated in Italy. This is made much more probable by the fact that the Epistle was so long unknown to the Western churches, which seems inexplicable if it had been originally addressed to Roman or Italian Jewish Christians.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

TRANSLATION.

A. C. KENDRICK, D. D.

1 FRAGMENTARILY and diversely [1] God, having of old spoken unto our fathers
2 in the prophets, hath in the close of these days spoken unto us in his Son,[2] whom
3 he hath appointed inheritor of all things: by whom also he made the worlds;[3] who,
being the effulgence of his glory, and the express image of his substance, and
sustaining all things with the mandate of his power, after making a cleansing of
4 sins, took his seat at the right hand of Majesty in the lofty [4] [heavens], becom-
ing [5] so much superior to the angels, as he hath inherited a name transcending
5 theirs. For unto which of the angels said he at any time,

Thou art my Son;
To day have I begotten thee?

and again,

I will be to him a Father,
And he shall be to me a Son?

6 And when he shall bring back into the inhabited world the Firstborn, he
7 saith,[6] And let all the angels of God worship him. And while in respect to the
angels he saith,

Who maketh his angels (messengers) winds,
And his ministers a flame of fire:

8 [He saith] in respect to the Son,

Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever;
The sceptre of rectitude is the sceptre of thy kingdom.
9 Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity;
Therefore, O God, thy God [7] hath anointed thee
With the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

10 And,

Thou, Lord, in the beginning didst lay the foundations of the earth,
And the works of thine hands are the heavens.

---

1 *Fragmentarily*, as to substance: *diversely*, as to mode. Or, in many portions and many modes.

2 Greek, Ἐν Υἱῷ. The absence of the article emphasizing the character.

3 Or, *ages*.

4 Ἐν ὑψηλοῖς belongs in construction to ἐκάθισεν.

5 Γενόμενος, not, *being made*, as Common Version, nor, *having become*, as Revised Version, nor, *having proved himself*, as Farrar: but *becoming* (the simplest and most natural rendering of the participle); *i. e.*, thus in his outward exaltation reaching the position that corresponded with his measureless intrinsic dignity. He thus became outwardly and entirely what he was already in his essential nature.

6 Proleptic, equivalent to, *will say*.

7 Or, *God, thy God*.

11 They shall perish, but thou continuest:
And they all as a garment will grow old;
And as a vesture shalt thou roll them up,
And they shall be changed.[1]
12 But thou art the same,
And thy years shall not fail.
13 And in respect to which of the angels hath he said at any time,
Sit thou at my right hand,
Until I shall make thine enemies thy footstool?[2]
14 Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to render service for the sake of them that are to inherit salvation?

2 For this cause we ought the more earnestly to give heed to the things which
2 have been heard,[3] lest, perchance, we drift away from them. For if the word which was spoken through angels proved stedfast, and every transgression and
3 neglect received a rightful recompense, how shall *we* escape after neglecting so great a salvation? which having at the beginning been spoken through the
4 Lord, was by them that heard him confirmed unto us, God bearing them joint attestation alike with signs, and portents, and various acts of power, and impartings of the Holy Spirit, according to his will.
5 For not unto angels did he put in subjection the coming world concerning
6 which we are speaking. But one in a certain place testified, saying,
What is a man that thou art mindful of him;
Or a son of man that thou regardest him?
7 Thou didst lower him some little below the angels;
With glory and honor didst thou crown him;
[Thou didst set him over the works of thy hands;]
8 Thou didst subject all things beneath his feet.
For in subjecting to him all things, he left nothing unsubjected to him. But
9 as it is, we do not yet see all things subjected to him. But him who hath been for some little made lower than the angels, even Jesus, we behold, because of his suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, that, by the grace of God,
10 he might, on behalf of every man,[4] taste of death. For it was befitting him, because of whom are all things, and through whom are all things to render, as

---

[1] So Tischendorf, Ed. 8. Westcott and Hort, after ℵ A B read, "As a garment, and they shall be changed." Or, "As a garment also shall they be changed." The reading would seem to be from some MS. error.

[2] Literally, *The footstool of thy feet.*

[3] Τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσι, literally, *the things which were heard*, answering to, οἱ λαληθέντες, *which were spoken.*

[4] Pregnant construction apparently equivalent to, that the death which he had tasted might be for the benefit of every man—that is, of universal humanity. So somewhat similarly 1 Peter 4 : 6. "The gospel was preached to the dead, that they might be judged, indeed," equivalent to, "although they had been judged, etc., they might live, etc."

one bringing many sons unto glory, the Leader of their salvation perfect through
11 sufferings. For both he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all
12 from One:[1] for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying,

I will announce thy name unto my brethren;
In the midst of the congregation I will sing praise to thee.

And again,

I will put my trust in him:

13 And again,

Behold, I and the children that God gave to me.

14 Since therefore the children have shared in blood and flesh, he himself also similarly took part in the same; that through death he may destroy him that
15 hath the dominion of death, that is, the devil; and may deliver those who
16 through fear of death are, through all their lifetime, subjects of bondage. For it is not, in sooth,[2] angels of whom he cometh to the rescue, but he rescueth the
17 seed of Abraham. Whence it behooved him to be in all things assimilated to his brethren, that he may prove himself merciful and a faithful high priest in
18 things relating to God, to make expiation for the sins of the people. For wherein he hath himself suffered being tempted,[3] he is able to succor them that are tempted.

3 Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of a heavenly calling, contemplate the
2 apostle and high priest of our confession, Jesus, as one who was faithful to him
3 that made him,[4] as was also Moses in all His house. For he hath been deemed worthy of more glory than Moses, by how much more honor than the house
4 hath he who established it. For every house is established by some one;[5] but
5 he who established all things is God. And Moses, indeed, was faithful in all His house as a servant, for a testimony to that which was hereafter to be
6 spoken; but Christ as a Son over His house; whose house are we, if we hold fast unto the end our confidence, and the glorying of our hope.
7 Wherefore, according as saith the Holy Spirit,
8 To-day, if ye shall hear his voice,
Harden not your hearts, as in the provocation;
In the day of the temptation in the wilderness:
9 Where your fathers tempted me in making proof of me,
And saw my works during forty years:
10 Wherefore I was angry with this generation;

[1] 'One,' that is, Father.

[2] Δή που, a light and often slightly ironical particle of affirmation, "*You know doubtless*," "*you know I suppose*," "*in sooth*."

[3] Or, *wherein he hath suffered by being himself tempted*.

[4] Or, *appointed him*. Compare 1 Sam. 12: 6. It refers, doubtless, either to his human birth or his mediatorial exaltation.

[5] Has some subordinate and earthly founder, while the universal and supreme founder is God, to whom all are responsible, alike Moses and Jesus.

And I said, They always go astray in their heart;
But they did not know my ways:
11 So that I swore in my wrath,
They shall not enter into my rest.
12 Look to it, brethren, lest in any of you there shall be an evil heart of unbelief
13 in falling away from the Living God. But exhort one another, day by day, so long as it is still called 'to-day,'[1] that of you there be no one hardened by
14 the deceitfulness of sin. For we have become participants of Christ, provided
15 that we hold the beginning of our confidence stedfast unto the end. In its being said,

To-day if ye shall hear his voice,
Harden not your hearts as in the provocation.—

16 For who,[2] when they heard, provoked him? Nay, did not all they that came
17 out of Egypt through Moses? And with whom was he angry during forty years? Was it not with them that sinned? And their carcasses fell in the
18 wilderness! And to whom did he sware that they should not enter into his
19 rest, but to them that disobeyed him? And we *see* that they were not able to enter in because of unbelief!—

4 Let us fear, therefore, lest haply, though there remaineth a promise of
2 entering into his rest, any of you may seem to have come short of it. For we have, indeed, received the glad message just as did also they; but the word of their hearing did not profit them, not having united itself by faith with them[3]
3 that heard it. For we enter into his rest as those who have believed; according as he hath said,[4]

So that I sware in my wrath,
They shall not enter into my rest;

And this, indeed, his[5] works having been accomplished [and thus his rest
4 established] from the foundation of the world. For he hath said in a certain place concerning the seventh day thus, And God rested in the seventh day
5 from all his works. And in this place again [he hath said], They shall not
6 enter into my rest. Since therefore it remaineth[6] that some may enter into it, and they who formerly had the glad message did not enter in because of

---

[1] Or, *so long as the "to-day" is still called* [in your ears].

[2] For who, etc. Abrupt break in the preceding thought and construction, in order to sharpen the appeal he is about to make by reminding them *who* they were that thus sinned and perished.

[3] Or, *not having united itself with faith in them*, etc. Or, συγκεκερασμένους, not being united by faith with them that heard. as, perhaps, with Caleb and Joshua. But the idea is exceedingly harsh.

[4] The quotation seems made to prove by the fact that some are now excluded from it, that the rest did actually exist as a possibility for some.

[5] 'His': the article being here, I think, as often in Greek, equivalent to the pronoun.

[6] 'Remaineth': as a logical conclusion from the language.

7 disobedience, he again fixeth a certain day; namely, 'To-day;' saying in David
so long a time afterward (as hath been said before),

To-day, if ye shall hear his voice,
Harden not your hearts.'

8 For if Joshua had brought them to their rest, he would not after this be
9 speaking of another day. So then there remaineth a sabbatic rest for the people
10 of God. For he who hath [1] entered into His rest hath also himself rested from
his works even as God did from his own.

11 Let us be earnest, therefore, to enter into that rest, in order that none may fall
12 after the same example of disobedience. For the word of God is living and
effective, and sharper than a two-edged sword, and penetrating even to the
severing of soul and spirit—both joints and marrow—and sits in judgment on
13 the reflections and thoughts of the heart. And there is no created thing that
is not manifest in his presence; but all things are naked and laid bare to His
eyes with whom is our account.

14 Having, therefore, a Great High Priest who hath passed through the heavens,
15 Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession. For we have not an high
priest who cannot sympathize with our infirmities, but who hath been tried in all
16 respects like as we are, apart from sin. Let us approach, therefore, with boldness
to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy and find grace for seasonable
succor.

5 For every high priest, being taken from among men, is constituted in behalf
of men in things relating to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for
2 sins; being able to deal tenderly with the ignorant and erring, since he is him-
3 self also encompassed with infirmity, and because of it is bound, as for the
4 people, so also for himself, to bring offerings for sins. And not unto himself
doth any one take the honor, but being called of God, even as was Aaron.
5 So also Christ did not glorify himself to be made a high priest; but he [glori-
fied him] who said unto him,

Thou art my Son,
To day have I begotten thee;

6 even as he also saith in another place,

Thou art a priest forever,
After the order of Melchisedec.

7 Who, in the days of his flesh,[2] offering up[3] entreaties and supplications, with

[1] Κατέπαυσεν. If we refer this to Christ we should give to the aorist its stricter rendering, "He who rested," "rested also himself:" but if, as is more natural, to the believer, we render more idomatically "he who hath entered." "hath himself rested."

[2] Affirmation, by a striking example (the agony of Gethsemane), of the first essential priestly quality, his humanity (λαμβανόμενος ἐξ ἀνθρώπων).

[3] 'Offering up': on a single occasion (προσενέγκας, aorist participle); namely, in the Garden.

strong outcry and tears, to him who was able to save him from death, and being
8 hearkened to from his filial piety, although he was a Son, learned from that
9 which he suffered obedience; and being perfected, became to all who prove
10 obedient to him the author of an eternal salvation, being saluted by God as
high priest after the order of Melchisedec.
11 Concerning which matter[1] our discourse is long and hard of explanation,
12 since ye have become dull in your hearing. For when, on account of the time,
ye ought to be teachers, ye again have need that one teach you[2] the rudi-
mentary principles of the oracles of God, and have come to have need of milk,
13 and not of solid food. For every one who partaketh milk is without experience
14 in the doctrine of righteousness:[3] for he is an infant. But solid food is for
the mature, who, on account of habit, have their perceptions disciplined for the
discriminating of good and evil.

6 Wherefore passing from the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us
hasten on to maturity, not laying again a foundation of repentance from dead
2 works and faith toward God, of a teaching of baptisms and laying on of
3 hands, and of resurrection of the dead and an eternal judgment. And this will
4 we do, *provided that God permit.* For as to those who have been once for all
enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift and been made partakers of
5 the Holy Spirit, and tasted an excellent word[4] of God, and the powers of the
6 Coming World, and have fallen away, it is impossible to renew them again to
repentance, since they re-crucify for themselves the Son of God, and put him to
7 an open shame. For land that hath drunk the rain that cometh frequently
upon it, and bringeth forth herbage suitable for those for whose sake it is being
8 cultivated, partaketh in a blessing from God; but when it beareth thorns and
briars, it is rejected[5] and nigh unto a curse; of which the end is for burning.
9 But we are persuaded of the better alternative concerning you, beloved, and
10 things akin to salvation, although we are thus speaking. For God is not
unrighteous to prove forgetful of your work, and the love which ye exhibited
11 toward his name in that ye ministered to the saints, and still minister. But we
desire that each of you display the same zeal for the full perfection of his hope
12 unto the end, that ye may not prove sluggish, but imitators of them who
13 through faith and patient endurance inherit the promises. For God, in making
promise to Abraham, since he could swear by none greater, sware by himself,
14 saying, 'Assuredly, blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply
15 thee': and thus by patient endurance he obtained the promise. For men

---

[1] Either Christ's priesthood, or specially his Melchisedec priesthood I think the former. Certainly not Melchisedec himself.

[2] Or, *that we teach you what are* (τίνα for τινά).

[3] Or, *in a discourse of righteousness.*

[4] Ῥῆμα,, *utterance. ordinance;* not λόγος, *word* as properly vehicle of *thought, speech.*

[5] Τικτουσα, ἀδόκιμος, *disapproved, discarded;* the figure is that of life and responsibility.

16 indeed swear by the greater, and to them in every dispute a confirmatory limit
17 is the oath. In respect of which God, wishing to display more abundantly to
the heirs of the promise the unchangeableness of his counsel, interposed with
18 an oath; that by two unchangeable things in which it is impossible that God
should prove false, we may have strong encouragement, who have fled for refuge
19 to lay hold upon the hope that lies before us, which, as an anchor of the soul,
we have both sure and stedfast, and entering to the region within the veil,
20 where, as Forerunner on our behalf, Jesus entered, BECOMING, AFTER THE ORDER OF MELCHISEDEC, A HIGH PRIEST FOREVER.[1]

7 For this Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the Most High God, who met
Abraham as he was returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed
2 him; to whom also Abraham opportioned a tithe of all; being first by interpretation King of Righteousness, and then also King of Salem, which is, King of
3 Peace; without father, without mother, without record of descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life, remaineth a priest in perpetuity.
4 And observe how great is this man to whom also Abraham gave a tithe of
5 his choicest spoils—the patriarch. And while they who of the sons of Levi receive the priesthood, have a command, according to the law, to tithe the people—that is, their brethren, and that though they have issued from the loins
6 of Abraham—he who does not derive his descent from them has tithed Abraham,
7 and hath blessed the man who had the promises. And beyond all contradiction
8 the less is blessed by the greater. And here, indeed, dying men receive tithes;
9 but there, he of whom it is testified that he liveth. And, as one might say,
10 through Abraham also Levi, who receiveth tithes, has been tithed; for he was still in the loins of his father when Melchisedec met him.
11 If indeed, therefore, *accomplishment* was[2] through the Levitical priesthood (for on its basis the people have had their legislation) what need was[2] there that after the order of Melchisedec a different priest should arise, and not be called
12 after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being transferred, there becometh
13 also of necessity a transference of the law; [but it has been transferred]; for he of whom these things are said, is member of another tribe, from which none
14 hath given attendance at the altar. For it is conspicuously evident that our Lord hath arisen out of Judah, in respect to which tribe Moses spake nothing
15 concerning priests. And [the transfer] is still more abundantly evident if
16 [equivalent to, *in that*], after the likeness of Melchisedec, there ariseth a different priest, who is made not after the law of a fleshly commandment, but after
17 the power of an indissoluble life. (For it is testified,

---

[1] As the author enters more fully on the subject of the priesthood, he repeats formally and solemnly its three grand features: After the order of Melchisedec—high priest—forever.

[2] Or, *were—were there.*

Thou art a Priest *forever*,
After the order of Melchisedec)—
18 For there follows a disannulling of the preceding commandment because of
19 its impotence and unprofitableness—(for the law brought nothing to perfection)
—and the introduction in its stead of a better hope by which we draw near
to God.
20 And inasmuch as *it is* not without the swearing of an oath—for they indeed
21 have been made priests without an oath; but he with an oath through him
that saith in respect of him,
The Lord sware and will not repent,
22 Thou art a priest for ever;—
23 by so much also hath Jesus become the surety of a better covenant. And they,
indeed, have in numbers been made priests because of their being hindered by
24 death from abiding [in the priesthood]; but he, because of his continuing for-
25 ever, hath his priesthood untransmissible: whence also he is able to save unto
completeness[1] those who come to God through him, since he always liveth to
make intercession on their behalf.
26 For such a High Priest was [also] befitting us—holy, innocent, undefiled,
27 being separated from sinners, and become higher than the heavens! who hath
not necessity day by day, as those high priests, previously, on behalf of their
own sins, to offer sacrifices, then for those of the people; for this he did once
28 for all in offering up himself. For the law constitutes men high priests, having
infirmity: but the word of the oath, which succeedeth to the law, the Son, who
is perfected for evermore.

8 And as a chief point in the things which we are saying[2] we have such an
High Priest, who took his seat at the right hand of the throne of Majesty in the
2 heavens, as minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle, which the
3 Lord pitched, not man. For every high priest is appointed for offering both
gifts and sacrifices: whence it is necessary that also this one *have something*
4 *which he may offer*. For if, indeed,[3] he were on the earth he would not even be
5 a priest, since there exist those who offer gifts according to the law, who[4]
minister to a copy and shadow of the heavenly, according as Moses hath been
divinely admonished when about to construct the tabernacle; for look, saith
He, that thou make all things after the model which was shown to thee in
6 the mount. But as it is, he hath obtained a more excellent ministry by how
much also he is Mediator of a better covenant, that hath been enacted upon
7 better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless there would not

[1] Εἰς τὸ παντελές, *absolutely, completely, to perfection.*
[2] Literally, *which are being said.*
[3] Εἰ μὲν γάρ: other authorities read, εἰ μὲν οὖν, *if indeed now*, which seems less fitting to the connection.
[4] Οἵτινες, *such persons as.*

8 have been sought a place for a second. [But is not faultless.] For finding fault [with it], he saith to them:[1]

Behold the days come, saith the Lord,
That I will accomplish over the house of Israel and the house of Judah a new covenant,
9 Not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers,
In the day that I took them by the hand to lead them forth out of the land of Egypt:
Because they did not abide in my covenant,
And I disregarded them, saith the Lord.
10 Because this is the covenant which I will institute[2] with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord;
Putting my laws into their understanding,
Also upon their hearts will I inscribe them,
And I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people:
11 And they shall not teach each one his fellow-citizen, and each his brother, saying,
Know the Lord: because all shall know me, from the least of them unto the greatest:
12 Because I will be merciful to their iniquities, and of their sins I will make mention no more.

13 In his saying "a new [covenant]" he hath rendered antiquated the first; and that which is becoming antiquated and old is near to extinction.

9 Now the first [covenant] had ordinances of worship, and its sanctuary
2 belonging to this world. For a tabernacle was erected, the foremost one, in which was both the lampstand and the table, and the setting forth of the loaves
3 [shew bread]; which is called sanctuary [the Holy place]. And after the second
4 veil, the tabernacle which is called Holy of holies; having a golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid all around with gold, wherein was a golden pot holding the manna, and the rod of Aaron that budded, and the tables of the
5 covenant; and above it cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy seat; of which things we cannot now speak severally.

6 And these things having been thus arranged, into the foremost tabernacle
7 indeed, the priests enter[3] continually, accomplishing their sacred services; but into the second one, once in the year the high priest alone, *not without blood*,
8 which he offers for himself and the errors of the people: the Holy Spirit show-

---

[1] Some texts read αὐτούς, which requires "finding fault with them"; but the whole connection implies fault in the covenant, and the reading αὐτοῖς, attested by B, seems decidedly preferable.

[2] Διαθήσομαι, *I will covenant, institute, accomplish.*

[3] Εἰσίασιν, 'enter continually'; historical present; the author transports himself back into the time of the tabernacle and its service.

ing this, that the way into the holiest of all hath not yet been manifested,
9 while the foremost tabernacle still hath position; which is a parable for the
[then] present time, in accordance with which [parable] are offered both gifts
and sacrifices that cannot render perfect in the conscience him who offereth
10 service, [consisting] only in meats and drinks, and various immersions—fleshly
ordinances imposed until the season of reformation.

11 But Christ making his appearance, a High Priest of the good things that are
to come, by[1] the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands—
12 that is to say, not of this creation; and not through the blood of goats and
heifers, but through his own blood, entered once for all into the holy place,
13 procuring[2] [for us] an eternal redemption. For if the blood of goats and of
bulls, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling them that are defiled, sanctifieth
14 unto cleanness of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who,
through an eternal spirit, offered himself blameless unto God, cleanse our con-
science from dead works unto the serving of the living God.

15 And for this cause he is Mediator of a new covenant, in order that by a
death taking place for the redemption of the transgressions committed under
the first covenant, they who have been called may receive the promise of the
16 eternal inheritance. For where there is a testament,[3] there must be necessarily
17 adduced the death of the testator. For a testament becometh valid in the case
of the dead, since [look] whether it, perchance, hath any force while the
18 testator liveth. Whence neither hath the first covenant been inaugurated with-
19 out blood. For when every commandment had, according to the law, been
spoken by Moses to all the people, taking the blood of the heifers and the
goats with the water and scarlet wool and hyssop, he sprinkled both the book
20 itself and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the covenant which God
21 commanded unto you. And the tabernacle too, and all the vessels of the
22 service, he in like manner sprinkled with blood. And, as one may say, all
things are, according to the law, sprinkled with blood, and apart from the
23 shedding of blood there is no remission. It is necessary, therefore, that while
the copies of the things in the heavens are cleansed with these, the heavenly
24 things themselves be cleansed with better sacrifices than these. For into no
material sanctuary did Christ enter, the antitype of the true, but into heaven
25 itself, now to be manifested in the presence of God for us; and not that he may
oftentimes make an offering of himself, even as the high priest entereth into the

---

[1] 'By', that is, *through, by means of.*

[2] Εὑράμενος, not, *having procured*, but *procuring*, which he formally and fully accomplished by the actual entrance.

[3] Διαθήκη, *a testamentary disposition, a will, a covenant.* The word here slips for a moment half insensibly from the meaning of *covenant* to that of *testament*, turning on the pivot of a common word (διαθήκη), through a common element of meaning (dispensation, arrangement), and related by a common demand for a *death*, as *seal* of the covenant and *condition* of the testament.

26 holy place year by year with alien blood (since thus he must have necessarily
suffered many times since the foundation of the world), but as it is,[1] once for
all, in the consummation of the ages he hath been manifested through his sacri-
27 fice for the doing away of sin. And inasmuch as for men it is reserved once
28 to die, and after this a judgment, so also Christ, being once for all offered to
bear the sins of many, shall a second time, apart from sin, unto those who look
for him, appear for salvation.

10 For the law, having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image
of the things, can never with the same sacrifices year by year, which they offer
2 in perpetuity, make perfect those that engage in them. Since then would they
not have ceased to be offered, because that the worshipers, having once for all
3 been cleansed, would have no longer any consciousness of sins? But there is
4 in them year by year a renewed remembrance of sins. For it is impossible that
5 the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins. Wherefore as he entereth
into the world, he saith,

6 Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not;
But a body didst thou prepare for me;
In holocausts and sin offerings thou didst not have pleasure.
7 Then said I, Lo, I am come,
(In the roll of the book it stands written concerning me),[2]
To do thy will, O God.

8 Above while saying, Sacrifices and offerings and holocausts and sin offerings
thou wouldest not, nor didst have pleasure in (such as are offered according to
9 the law), then hath he said, Lo, I am come to do thy will. He taketh away
10 the first that he may establish the second. By which will we have been
sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.
11 And every priest, indeed, standeth ministering day by day, and offering many
12 times the same sacrifices, such as never can take away sins. But this one, after
offering one sacrifice for sins forever, took his seat[3] at the right hand of God,
13 henceforth awaiting till his enemies be placed as a footstool of his feet. For
14 by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.
15 And the Holy Spirit also testifieth for us. For after having said before,
16 This is the covenant which I will establish with them
In those days, saith the Lord;
Giving my laws upon their heart,

---

[1] Νυνὶ δέ, *but as it is;* doubtful, perhaps, whether this is the antithesis of ἵνα πολλάκις προσφέρῃ, ver. 25 (ἐπεὶ ἔδει-κόσμου being then thrown into parenthesis), or of πολλάκις παθεῖν, ver. 26, which in that case is released from the parenthesis. In any case the ἐπεὶ ἔδει is merely logical, *inferring* the singleness and finality of his entrance from the *fact* that it is the *first* and only one.

[2] Or, *it is prescribed to me.*

[3] Or. *took his seat forever.*

17 Even upon their understanding will I inscribe them,
And of their sins and their iniquities I will no longer have remembrance.
18 But where there is remission of these there is no longer an offering for sin.
19 Having therefore, brethren, boldness for our entrance into the sanctuary in
20 the blood of Jesus, by a way new and living, which he consecrated through
21 the vail, that is to say, his flesh; and [having] a great priest over the house
22 of God; let us approach unto him with a true heart, in full assurance of faith,
23 having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience. And having our bodies
washed with pure water, let us hold fast the confession of our hope unwaver-
24 ing—for he is faithful who promised—and let us regard closely one another
25 for incitement unto love and good works; not abandoning the assembling of
ourselves together, as is the custom of some; but exhorting one another, and by
so much the more as ye behold the day drawing near.
26 For if we voluntarily sin, after receiving the recognition of the truth, there
27 remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins; but a certain fearful expectancy of
28 judgment. and a fiery indignation[1] that is to devour the adversaries. One who
has violated the law of Moses, dies without compassion under two or three wit-
29 nesses: of how much sorer punishment, think ye, will he be deemed worthy who
has trampled under foot the Son of God, and counted unclean the blood of the
covenant with which he was consecrated, and done outrage to the Spirit of
30 grace. For we know him who said, Retribution is for me: I will recompense.
31 And again, 'The Lord will judge his people.' A fearful thing is it to fall into
the hands of the living God!
32 But call to mind the former days in which after being enlightened, ye endured
33 a great conflict of sufferings; on the one hand being made a gazing stock by
reproaches and afflictions; and on the other by being made participants with
34 them that were thus treated. For ye sympathized with the bondmen, and
received with joy the plundering of your possessions, knowing that ye had for
35 yourselves[2] a better and an abiding possession. Fling not away then your
36 boldness which hath a great recompense. For ye have need of endurance, in
order that by doing[3] the will of God ye may gain the promise.
37 For yet a little—how little!
He that cometh will come, and will not linger.
38 But my righteous one will live from faith:
And if he shrink back, my soul hath no pleasure in him.
39 But we belong not to them that shrink back unto perdition, but to them that
are of faith unto the gaining of the soul.

11 But Faith is the assurance of what is hoped for; a conviction of things which

[1] Πυρὸς ζῆλος. *jealousy or wrath of fire.* Fire being personified.
[2] Or, *knowing that ye had yourselves as a better*, etc. (So ℵ A.)
[3] Or, *after doing.*

are not seen. For in this the elders received their attestation. By faith we recognize that the worlds have been framed by the utterance of God, so that not out of things apparent hath sprung that which is seen. By faith Abel offered unto God a nobler sacrifice than Cain, through which he was testified to be righteous, God bearing testimony over his gifts, and through it, after dying, he still speaketh. By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and he was not found, because God had translated him. For before the translation he hath had the testimony borne to him that he hath pleased God. But without faith it is impossible to please him; for he who cometh to God must have faith that he is, and becometh a rewarder to them that seek for him. By faith Noah, being divinely warned concerning things that were not as yet beheld, filled with pious fear, constructed an ark for the saving of his house, through which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is according to faith. By faith Abraham, being called that he should go forth into the place which he was destined to receive for an inheritance, obeyed, and went forth, not knowing whither he was going. By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as an alien land, dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob, heirs with him of the same promise. For he was looking for the city that hath the foundations, whose architect and builder is God. By faith also Sarah herself received power for the conception of seed,[1] even when past age, since she counted faithful him who had promised. For which reason also there were begotten from one, and him, too, as good as dead, even as the stars of heaven in multitude, and as the sand which is along the margin of the sea, the innumerable.

In accordance with faith did all these die, not receiving the promises, but seeing them from afar, and greeting them, and acknowledging that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that use such language show clearly that they are seeking a country of their own.[2] And if, indeed, they had had in mind that country from which they had gone forth, they would have had opportunity to return to it. But as it is, they yearn for a better [fatherland], even a heavenly. For which reason God is not ashamed to call himself their God; for he hath prepared for them a city.

By faith Abraham, being put to trial, hath offered up Isaac; and he who had accepted the promises was offering up his only-begotten son, in respect to whom it was said, In Isaac shall thy seed be called; reckoning that God is able to raise even from the dead; whence also he received him in a figure.[3] By faith also Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau concerning the things which were in the future. By faith Jacob, when dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph, and bowed in worship upon the top of his staff. By faith Joseph, in dying, made mention of the departure of the sons of Israel, and gave commandment

---

[1] Or, *for the founding of an offspring.* [2] Πατρίδα, *a fatherland;* Alford, *a home.* [3] Or, *similitude.*

23 concerning his bones. By faith Moses, when he was born, was hidden during
three months by his parents, because they saw that the child was fair, and they
24 did not stand in fear of the command of the king. By faith Moses, on being
25 grown up, refused to be called the son of the daughter of Pharaoh, choosing
rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to have a temporary
26 enjoyment from sin, accounting as greater riches than the treasures of Egypt
the reproach of Christ; for he was looking away to the rendering of the reward.
27 By faith he quitted Egypt, not standing in fear of the wrath of the king; for
28 he endured as seeing [the king] that is unseen. By faith he hath observed [1] the
passover and the sprinkling of the blood, in order that he who destroyeth
29 the firstborn may not touch them. By faith they passed through the Red Sea
as through dry land, which the Egyptians attempting to do, were swallowed
30 up. By faith the walls of Jericho fell after being encircled for seven days.
31 By faith Rahab, the harlot, did not perish with them that had proved disobedi-
ent, having received the spies with peace.

32 And what shall I say farther? For the time will fail me recounting con-
33 cerning Gideon, and Barak, and Samson, and Jephthah; David, and Samuel,
and the prophets: who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness,
34 obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the power of fire,
escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were rendered mighty, proved
35 valiant in war, turned to flight embattled hosts of aliens. Women received
36 their dead by resurrection: and others were broken on a wheel, not accepting
37 deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection. And others bore
trial of mockings and scourgings; and, yet further, of bonds and imprisonment:
they were stoned, they were tempted,[2] they were sawn asunder, they died by
slaughter of the sword; they went about in sheepskins, in goatskins; being
38 destitute, afflicted, maltreated—of whom the world was not worthy—wandering
39 in deserts and mountains and caverns and the hollows of the earth. And these
40 all being witnessed to through their faith, received not the promise, God pro-
viding something better concerning us, that apart from us they should not be
made perfect.

12 Therefore[3] let also us, since we have so great a cloud of witnesses encompass-
ing us, laying aside every weight, and our easily besetting sin,[4] run enduringly
2 the race[5] that lieth before us, looking away unto the Leader and Perfecter of
our faith, even Jesus, who, in view[6] of the joy that lay before him, endured a

---

[1] Or, instituted (πεποίηκεν).

[2] Ἐπειράσθησαν; but far more probable, would seem alike in the rhetorical and historical connection, ἐπρήσθησαν, *they were burned;* a change which may have been easily made, though the reading is without MS. authority.

[3] Τοιγαροῦν. *therefore;* a long, weighty, emphatic particle (τοί, γέ, ἄρα, οὖν, *by this, that is to say, then, now*), 1 Thess. 4 : 8.

Or, *clinging, enfolding.*

[5] Ἀγών, literally, *contest, struggle.*

[6] Ἀντί. *in face of. in exchange for.*

cross, making light of shame, and hath taken his seat at the right hand of the
3 throne of God. For consider earnestly him who hath endured such contradiction at the hands of sinners against himself,[1] that ye be not wearied out and
4 utterly fainting in your souls. Ye have not yet[2] resisted unto blood in your
5 struggle against sin; and ye have forgotten the exhortation which discourseth with you as with sons,

My son, regard not lightly the chastening of the Lord,
Nor faint when thou art reproved by him:
6 For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth,
And scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.

7 It is for discipline that ye endure; God is dealing with you as sons; for what
8 son is he whom his father chastiseth not? And if ye are without chastisement, of which all [sons] have become partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons.
9 *Then*,[3] did we have the fathers of our flesh as chasteners, and give them heed, [and] shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of our spirits, and
10 live? For they indeed chastened us with reference to a few days, according to their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we may be partakers of his
11 holiness. And all chastening for the present, indeed, seemeth to be not matter of joy, but of pain; yet afterward it yieldeth a peaceful fruit of righteousness to them that have been disciplined thereby.
12 Wherefore right ye up the relaxed hands and the palsied knees.
13 And for your footsteps make ye level pathways; that what is lame be not turned out of the way, but rather be healed.
14 Pursue after peace with all, and sanctity, without which none shall look
15 upon the Lord. Watching carefully lest there be any falling short of the grace of God;[4] lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and by means of
16 it the many be defiled; lest [there be] any fornicator or profane one, like Esau,
17 who for one meal sold his own birthright. For ye know that afterward, when he would fain inherit the blessing, he was rejected (for he found no place[5] for repentance), although he sought it earnestly with tears.
18 For ye have not drawn near to a palpable [and material] mountain,[6] and to
19 enkindled fire,[7] and to darkness and gloom and tempest, and to the sound of a trumpet, and a voice of uttered words, which they who heard refused, entreating

---

[1] Or, *themselves*, ἑαυτούς, a ℵ D E.

[2] Probably here of internal and spiritual struggle.

[3] Εἶτα, more commonly explained here as *furthermore;* but, I think, erroneously. I take it as the familiar Greek particle of surprise and emotion; *then*, emphatic as often in English. To τοὺς μέν, οὐ πολὺ (δὲ) μᾶλλον would regularly correspond.

[4] Or, *lest any one* [be] *lacking the grace of God—lest any root*, etc. The μή τις perhaps takes up the broken construction.

[5] *For effectual repentance;* his regret was too late and unavailing. 'It'; namely, the blessing of the birthright.

[6] Ὄρει, read by Tischendorf, and apparently demanded by the antithesis.

[7] Or, *to a palpable mountain and burning with fire.*

20 that no further discourse be addressed to them. For they endured not the injunc-
21 tion, Even if a beast touch the mountain it shall be stoned; and, so fearful was the
22 spectacle, Moses said: I am terrified and trembling! But ye have approached
unto Mount Sion, and the city of the Living God, the heavenly Jerusalem,
23 and to myriads of angels, a festal company,[1] and to a congregation of first-
born ones who are registered in heaven, and as judge to the God of all, and to
24 the spirits of righteous ones made perfect, and to Jesus, Mediator of a New
Covenant, and to a blood of sprinkling that speaketh more mightily than that
25 of Abel.[2] See that ye refuse not him who is speaking. For if they escaped not
when they refused [to listen] to him who uttered the divine warning on earth,
much rather [shall not] we who turn away from him who [uttereth it] from
26 the heavens. Whose voice then shook the earth, but now he hath promised,
saying: Yet once for all I will shake not only the earth, but also heaven. And
27 this 'yet once for all' shows the removal of the things which are shaken, as
things that have been made, that the things which are not shaken may remain.
28 Wherefore, let us, since we receive a kingdom that is unshaken, cherish thank-
fulness, through which we may acceptably serve God with reverent awe and
29 fear. For also our God is a consuming fire.

13 Let brotherly love continue. Be not forgetful of the entertaining of
2 strangers: for thereby some have unawares entertained angels. Remember
3 those in bonds as bound with them; them that are ill treated as being your-
4 selves also in the body. Be marriage held in honor among all, and its bed
5 undefiled: for fornicators and adulterers God will judge. Be your disposition
without avarice, satisfied with your present goods; for he himself hath said, I
6 will in no wise leave thee, nor in any wise abandon thee. So that with confi-
dence we may say,

The Lord is a helper unto me, and I will not be afraid;
What shall a man do unto me?

7 Bear in memory those who were your leaders, such as spoke to you the word
of God; and surveying the issue of their course of life, imitate their faith.
8 Jesus Christ is yesterday and to-day the same, and forever. Be not drawn aside
9 by various and strange teachings. It is an excellent thing that our hearts be
established with grace, not with meats with which they that were conversant,
10 were not benefited. We have an altar from which they have no license to eat
11 who serve the tabernacle. For of whatever animals the blood is borne into
the sanctuary by the high priest, of these the bodies are burned outside of the
12 encampment. Wherefore also Jesus, that he might by his own blood sanctify
13 the people, suffered without the city. Therefore let us go forth unto him
14 without the camp, bearing his reproach: for we have not here an abiding city,

[1] Or, *and to myriads, a festal host of angels.* [2] Or, *more mightily than Abel.*

15 but we seek that which is to come. Through him, therefore, let us offer up
always a sacrifice of praise to God, that is, the fruit of lips making acknowledg
16 ment to his name. And of doing good and of communicating be not forgetful,
17 for with such sacrifices God is well pleased. Obey those that have the leader-
ship of you, and submit to them. For they themselves watch sleeplessly for
your souls, as having to render an account; that they may do this with joy,
and not with sighing: for this were unprofitable to you.
18 Pray for us: for we persuade ourselves that we have a good conscience, wish-
19 ing in all things to conduct ourselves becomingly. And I the more exceedingly
exhort you to do this, that I may the sooner be restored to you.
20 And may the God of peace, who brought back from the dead, in the blood
21 of an eternal covenant, the Great Shepherd of the sheep, our Lord Jesus, perfect
you thoroughly in every good work unto the doing of his will, working in you[1]
that which is well pleasing in his sight through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory
forever and ever. Amen.
22 And I beseech you, brethren, bear with my word of exhortation; for I have
23 written to you in all brevity. Know that our brother Timothy has been set at
liberty; with whom, if he come quickly, I shall see you.
24 Salute all them that have the guidance of you, and all the saints. Those from
Italy salute you.
25 Grace be with you all.

[1] Ὑμῖν: a somewhat better attested reading, ἡμῖν, *us*. But the two words, becom'ng alike in sound, were often confounded in the MSS., and here ὑμῖν seems far more probable

COMMENTARY

ON THE

EPISTLE OF JAMES.

BY

EDWIN T. WINKLER, D. D

PHILADELPHIA
THE AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY
1701-1703 CHESTNUT STREET

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1888, by the
AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

Printed in U. S. A.

INTRODUCTION TO THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JAMES.

I. AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLE.

THE title assumed by our author, "Servant of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 : 1), would of itself naturally suggest the conclusion that he was not an apostle, and hence that he must be identified neither with James the son of Zebedee, nor James the Little, the son of Alphæus—both of whom were upon the apostolic lists—but rather with the James whom the gospels and epistles designate as "the Lord's brother" (Matt. 13 : 55 ; Mark 6 : 3 ; Gal. 1 : 19), and who, as appears from the history (Acts 12 : 17 ; 15 : 13 ff. ; 21 : 18 seq.), and also from Paul's testimony (Gal. 2 : 9), had great influence in the mother-church at Jerusalem. James the Elder, the son of Zebedee, and the brother of John the Evangelist, fell a victim at an early period (about A. D. 42) to his impetuous zeal in propagating the gospel. (Acts 12 : 2.) Even sooner than he does James, the son of Alphæus, disappear from the evangelic history, having probably encountered a similar fate in regions remote from Palestine. James, the brother of the Lord, and the brother of Jude (Jude 1), lived, says Hegesippus, until the destruction of Jerusalem was near at hand ; and during that period (extending according to Josephus to the year A. D. 63), exercised pastoral authority in the metropolitan church of the Jewish Christians. The Jews recognized him as a righteous man, and tradition gives him the title of "the Just." To this eminent disciple every probability assigns the authorship of the Epistle—a conclusion in which the majority of interpreters are agreed.

Yet there is a pretty general unwillingness to accept the literal statement that this James was the brother of our Lord ; the deep-rooted prejudice in favor of the celibacy of the Virgin Mother being the main difficulty in the way.

Hence, some have insisted that James, the Lord's brother, was the same person as James the Little, the son of Alphæus. They argue that Alphæus is the Greek form of the Hebrew Cleophas ; that Mary, the wife of Cleophas, and the mother of James and Joses (Mark 15 : 40), was sister to Mary, the mother of Jesus ; that James was therefore the cousin of Jesus, and that merely that remoter relationship may be indicated by the title, "Brother of the Lord."

But these positions are not tenable. For, 1. The evidence is not entirely satisfactory that Alphæus and Cleophas are the same name. 2. It is highly improbable that two sisters should have each had the same name. 3. It is quite certain that Mary, the wife of Cleophas, was not the sister of Mary, the wife of Joseph. There were four women at the cross of Jesus, one of whom was "his mother's sister." (John 19 : 25.) She was not named by John, who here displays his characteristic modesty, for she was his own mother, Salome ; but this omission is supplied by the other evangelists. (Matt. 27 : 56 ; Mark 15 : 40.) 4. The employment of the title "brother" to indicate a cousin is contrary to usage. The more tender title for such a kinsman could only be used under special circumstances, but by no means as a common designation. 5. And finally, neither James,

nor any other of the brothers of Jesus, was ranked among the twelve. "The brothers of Jesus" were distinguished from the apostles, both during the early ministry of our Lord (Matt. 12 : 46), and after the resurrection, when for the first time they believed on him. (John 7 : 5; Acts 1 : 14.) The phraseology of Gal. 1 : 19 and 1 Cor. 15 : 7 does not contradict this conclusion—the former of these texts signifying "other of the apostles saw I not, but I saw James," and the latter that Christ appeared not only to James, but to all the apostles.

Other interpreters, however, who recognize James with his brothers and sisters as the members of Mary's immediate family (Matt. 12 : 46 ; Luke 8 : 19), maintain (after Origen) that these were not the children of Mary and Joseph, but the children of the latter by a previous marriage. But this conclusion is also without just grounds, and is plainly dictated by a low idea of the sacredness of the marriage relation, an idea wholly foreign to the inspired writers, and to the Hebrew people. As to the evangelists, they have no hesitation in representing Mary as the wife of Joseph, after the birth of our Lord. For, 1. Jesus is designated as Mary's "first-born son," an expression which naturally, if not necessarily, implies that other children followed. 2. It is stated that Joseph "knew not his wife" until after the birth of Jesus (Matt. 1 : 25), which proves that he did then assume the full conjugal relation. 3. There is nothing whatever to warrant the supposition that Joseph was a widower at the time when he married Mary, or that the brothers and sisters of Jesus were not Mary's children by Joseph. And in this connection it may be added, as Angus shrewdly observes, that if they were Joseph's elder children, Jesus would not have been the heir to David's throne. (Note on Matt. 13 : 55.) 4. We read of only one wife to Joseph ; and it is she who appears as the head of the family, in the circle of their children, the type of the household of the redeemed. (Matt. 12 : 50.) This common association suggests that Mary was their mother, a conclusion which Lightfoot would negative by the suggestion that our Lord's brethren, being always in the company, and under the direction of Mary, may be explained by the fact that Joseph was already dead. This is not, indeed, impossible ; and yet in John 6 : 42. Joseph seems referred to as then living : "Whose father and mother *we know*." 5. And finally, the main argument upon which Lightfoot relies, that had James been the son of Mary, Jesus would not have committed her to the care of John, does not avail if, as is quite conceivable, John was in a condition to take care of Mary, as James and the other brothers could not. But see Lightfoot on Galatians, Diss. II.

II. CHARACTERISTIC TRAITS.

The characteristic qualities of James may to some extent be inferred from the Epistle. That he was a man of culture may be concluded from his easy and generally perspicuous Greek, which, however, is not without a tinge of Hebrew symbolism and sententiousness : and also from the form of the Epistle, which is arranged after the order of a Greek oration, and already affords a type of the modern sermon, having an exordium, a division into three heads which are separately considered, and finally a peroration by recapitulation. Especially do the allusions of James show a familiarity with the ethical books of his people, both the canonical and the apocryphal.

That James had a poetic sympathy with nature is apparent in the number of figures and local allusions which he employs, and which are racy of Palestine. Thus he speaks of the sea in phrases full of expression (1 : 6 ; 3 : 4) ; of the flowers (1 : 10) ; of the fig, the olive, and the vine (3 : 12) ; of the fresh and salt springs of his native country (3 : 11

12); of the drought (5 : 17, 18); of the Simoom from the Arabian Desert (1 : 11); and of the early and the latter rains. In the changeful objects around him he discerned the types of spiritual and eternal realities.

Further, that our writer was pre-eminently, as he denominates himself, "a servant of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ," appears from the entire tone of his Epistle. He commended faith, heavenly wisdom, and prayer; he urged docility, reticence, and self-control; he insisted upon fraternity, charity, and forgiveness; he proclaimed that a religion which had no restraining influence over the passions and no formative influence over the character and the conduct was utterly worthless in the sight of God. In the spirit, and in not a few of the expressions, of his Epistle, he displays a striking family likeness to that greater preacher who gave the world the sermon on the Mount. James also employs the didactic style, sentences sharply proverbial, and a variety of illustrations and examples, as the best appliances for interesting and instructing the popular mind. He dispensed "wisdom's dole at wisdom's gate." (Prov. 8 : 34.)

III. DESTINATION OF THE EPISTLE.

The difficulty of deciding satisfactorily to what class of readers the Epistle was addressed, shows that it belongs to the archaic age of Christianity, when nice distinctions had not yet been established; when the Jews of the Dispersion (1 : 1) had not yet set themselves against the Lord and his anointed; when the Jewish Christians still recognized their place of worship, as a synagogue (rendered "assembly" in our Version, 2 : 2) and retained much of the old ritual service (1 : 27); and when believing Gentiles were regarded as having entered into fellowship *with Israel*, just as the proselytes had been recognized as Jews. The age was chaotic. The light shone in the darkness and the darkness comprehended it not. These peculiar circumstances explain the indeterminateness of the address. Those whom James had mainly in view were, beyond all question, Jewish Christians, who had been begotten through the word of truth (1 : 18); who had exercised faith in Christ (2 : 1, 14); and had been baptized into his name (2 : 7); and whose hope in persecution was fixed upon the coming of the Lord (5 : 7). But, in the address, James comprehended others also. With a love that followed his people in their estrangements, and with a prescient hope that many of them would be convicted of sin through their own violated law, and be brought to repentance and salvation, he addressed his Epistle to the Jews of the Dispersion, the twelve tribes whose nationality was now broken up. He appealed to the rich among them, who largely belonged to the sect of the Sadducees, and had control of the civil power which they employed against the poor Christians, and he urged them to the exercise of justice and humanity. He attacked the barren orthodoxy of the Pharisees, who supposed that their knowledge of God sufficed for salvation, and whose teachings were not without a pernicious influence upon the Christians themselves. And he corrected the false estimates of the worth of that mere ceremonial worship, which prevailed extensively among all classes. In short, the Epistle, as it had the character, had also the scope of a sermon.

Not only the salutation (1 : 1; comp. Matt. 15 : 24; 1 Peter 1 : 1), but also the similarity of the themes discussed, and even of the expressions used, show that the author of this Epistle had in view the same classes of persons to whom our Lord preached, and to whom the First Epistle of Peter was addressed. They also illustrate the character and condition of these persons, by presenting the themes most familiarly insisted upon by the earliest preachers of Christianity.

To the Sermon on the Mount, the allusions of James are distinct and frequent: Compare 1 : 2, on joy in trial, with Matt. 5 : 12; James 1 : 4, on Christian perfection, with Matt. 5 : 48; James 1 : 5; 5 : 15, on prayer, with Matt. 7 : 7–12; James 1 : 9; 4 : 11, on the exaltation of the lowly, with Matt. 5 : 3, 4; James 1 : 20, on the wrath of man, with Matt. 5 : 22; James 2 : 13, on judgment without mercy, with Matt. 6 : 14, 15; 5 : 7; James 2 : 14, on faith without works, with Matt. 7 : 21–23; James 3 : 17, 18, on peaceful and gentle wisdom, with Matt. 5 : 9; James 4 : 7, on friendship with the world, with Matt. 6 : 24; James 4 : 11, on censorious judgments, with Matt. 7 : 1–5; James 5 : 2, on perishing riches, with Matt. 6 : 19; James 5 : 10, on the endurance of the prophets, with Matt. 5 : 12; James 5 : 12, on swearing, with Matt. 5 : 33–37.[1]

On the other hand, Peter as freely repeats the language and thought of James, as the latter quotes from the Sermon on the Mount. Compare 1 : 2, on joy in temptations, with 1 Peter 4 : 12, 13; James 1 : 11, on the withering grass and fading flowers, with 1 Peter 1 : 24; James 1 : 18, on spiritual birth, with 1 Peter 1 : 3, which supplements it; James 1 : 21, on amendment of life and growth in knowledge, with 1 Peter 2 : 1; James 2 : 7, on blaspheming the name of Christ, with 1 Peter 4 : 14, where this is instanced in the reproach of Christ's people; James 3 : 13, on commending the gospel by good conduct, with 1 Peter 2 : 12; James 4 : 1, on the lusts warring within, with 1 Peter 2 : 11; James 4 : 6, on God's dealings with the proud and the humble, with 1 Peter 5 : 5, 6; James 4 : 7, on submitting to God and resisting the devil, with 1 Peter 5 : 6–9; James 4 : 10, on humility and exaltation, with 1 Peter 5 : 6; and, finally, James 5 : 20, on hiding a multitude of sins, with 1 Peter 4 : 8, which explains the statement. In some of these instances of parallelism the two writers doubtless drew from the common source indicated above. On the relation of the two Epistles, Van Oosterzee remarks: "The twofold tendency of the Epistles of Peter, *consolation and exhortation*, is, in the Epistle of James, blended into one." "N. T. Theol.," § 31, 6.

IV. AIM OF THE EPISTLE.

The primary design of the Epistle was to encourage holy living amid the peculiar temptations and trials to which the Jewish Christians were exposed. Hence, whatever considerations were calculated to produce patient steadfastness, unworldliness, and mutual serviceableness were earnestly insisted upon; those offences which disturbed the purity and peace of the churches were sternly reprobated; and, in particular, the abuse of the doctrines of Divine Sovereignty as related to sin, and of salvation by faith, was emphatically condemned. On the other hand, the oppressors of Christians were denounced for their injustice, and were threatened with speedy retribution. The homiletical character of the Epistle allowed easily of such changes of address. The letter was sent to the care of no special church or group of churches. It is a catholic, or general, Epistle; it was intended to be multiplied and circulated as widely as possible, so that it might correct improprieties in the growing and poorly-supplied churches, and instruct the minds and consciences of individual believers.

V. TIME OF COMPOSITION.

From the style and contents of the Epistle, we may infer that it was the first of this class of New Testament writings—a place which it holds in the oldest manuscripts.

[1] Athanasius states that the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew was translated into Greek by James, the Bishop of Jerusalem. Tom. II., p. 102, Stanley's "Sermons and Essays," p. 291 n.

Compare Stanley's "Apostolic Age," p. 290. There are, however, but few indications to fix the date of composition. It was written, probably, but not certainly, when the disciples were already called Christians (2 : 7, A. D. 43 ?), and hence, after the establishment of the Christian Church at Antioch. (Acts 11 : 26.) The knowledge of the gospel was already widely extended. Various churches had now been established, with their elders and places of worship. (5 : 14; 2 : 2.) Troubles had begun to arise from the ambition of the teachers (3 : 1), as well as from the oppressions of wealthy and powerful persecutors. (2 : 6; 5 : 1–6.) From this last circumstance it may be concluded that the Christian communities of those days consisted mostly of the laboring poor. The Epistle certainly belongs to the early Apostolic Age, and nothing in its contents contradicts the judgment of Neander, that its date precedes the time when separate Gentile churches were formed, before the relation of Jews and Gentiles in the Christian Church had been brought under discussion. Most modern interpreters and historians assign it to the year 45. So Alford. Nor is there any ground to question the prevaling opinion that this letter to the Tribes of the Dispersion was written at Jerusalem.

VI. AUTHENTICITY.

The most important evidence of the authenticity of this Epistle is its reception into the Peshito, the venerable Syriac Version of the New Testament, which was made in the second century, and in a region lying beside Palestine. The Syrian, Ephrem, also quotes from it, ascribing it to James, the brother of the Lord. It is alluded to in that ancient Christian document, "The Shepherd," of Hermas, and is cited by Clement of Rome, Irenæus, Origen, and others of the early Christian writers. When the claims of the Epistle were considered at the Council of Nice, in the fourth century, all doubt as to its canonical authority was set at rest, and it was received as an inspired writing both by the Eastern and the Western churches. At the Reformation, the question as to its claims was revived by Erasmus, Luther, and others, and has, from time to time, been recalled by subsequent Christian writers. The main argument against the authenticity of the Epistle is, however, theological—the apparent contradiction between the doctrine of James and that of the Apostle Paul. But this difficulty clearly belongs to the department of interpretation, rather than that of historical evidence, and should be left for adjustment to the interpreter. An able contribution to the discussion has been made by Neander, who argues that there can be no discrepancy between the two writers, Paul and James; since, without having any reference to each other, they addressed different classes of people from different standpoints, using, however, the same familiar examples: and the great Expositor precisely indicates the position of this Epistle among the other and later writings of the New Testament, when he says of James, that "he received the new spirit under the old forms." How the doctrinal objections to the Epistle are to be met, will be most satisfactorily shown in the exposition of the texts in which these difficulties are found. The great body of interpreters agree in recognizing the authorship of James, and the integrity of the Epistle in its component parts.

The doubt entertained by many (like Eusebius), at first, in regard to the canonical character of the Epistle is explained, not only by the seeming opposition in doctrine between Paul and James—a circumstance to which reference has already been made—but by the fact that the Epistle was specially committed to the charge of Jewish Christians, who were separated to some extent from the other believers; and also that James, although a brother of the Lord, and a man of apostolic weight, was not an apostle. Yet,

as Huther shrewdly remarks, "These circumstances, while they interferred with the general reception of the Epistle at the first, add to the historic value of the ancient testimonies when it was accepted finally." The distinction between this Epistle and the spurious writings which claimed an apostolic origin is marked. The latter contain matters false and foolish—contrary either to the proprieties of providence, or to the truth of doctrine or history; the former is characterized by a self-evidencing truth, solemnity, and majesty beseeming a message from the King of kings. Among the writers of the New Testament, James held a place and displayed a character closely resembling those of John the Baptist among the heralds of the New Dispensation.

VII. ANALYSIS OF THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

The Analysis of this Epistle is rendered difficult by two circumstances. 1. The style is sententious and proverbial, resembling that of the Sermon on the Mount, to which the author makes frequent allusion. 2. The themes discussed are so related to each other that they here and there overlap the author's divisions; so that subjects, which have their own appropriate place in the argument, are sometimes resumed and sometimes anticipated. Yet the plan is, in its main outlines, regular and even rhetorical; having an Introduction, or Theme, with its Divisions, which are considered in their order, and a Practical Conclusion, in which the argument is recapitulated.

INTRODUCTION.—The persons addressed and the occasion of the Epistle. (1 : 1–18.)

1. *Greeting.* To the Jews of the Dispersion, in especial those of them who had been converted to Christianity. (Ver. 1.)

2. *Occasion.* The trials and temptations of his readers, whom he exhorts to steadfast, patient, and prayerful endurance. (Ver. 2–18.)

1) *Exhortation to cheerful steadfastness under trials.* (Ver. 2–12.)

a. Amid conflicts and afflictions believers have reason to rejoice. (Ver. 2–4.)

b. Superiority to affliction may be secured by prayer. (Ver. 5–8.)

c. Another help to heroic steadfastness is a just estimate of the conditions of life, and also of the results of trials borne in a Christian spirit. (Ver. 9–12.)

2) *Exhortation to cheerful steadfastness under temptations to sin.* (Ver. 13–18.)

a. Argument from the nature of God. (Ver. 13.)

b. From the experiences of men under temptation. (Ver. 14, 15.)

c. From the divine dispensation. (Ver. 16–18.)

THEME AND DIVISION.—Characteristics of patient and godly sufferers. They must be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath. (Ver. 19, 20.)

I. DIVISION.—Amid their trials and temptations, the godly should be swift to hear. This theme James develops by showing what is involved in the reception of the divine word, and by replying to the Antinomian objection to his proposition so far as the preceptive part of the word is concerned. (1 : 21–2 : 26.)

1. *The word must be received as the inner law.* (Ver. 21.)

2. *And as the rule of life.* (Ver. 22–25.)

3. *The speech must be regulated by it.* (Ver. 26.)

4. *And the social intercourse.* (1 : 27–2 : 13.)

a. In society the gospel enjoins a ritual service of charity. (Ver. 27.)

b. In the church it is the principle of fellowship. (2 : 1–9.)

c. It sanctions all the precepts of the Second Table of the Law. (Ver. 10, 11.)

d. And enforces them by the decisions of the final judgment. (Ver. 12, 13.)

5. *Refutation of the objection that faith by itself suffices.* (Ver. 14–26.)
   a. Saving faith is practical. (Ver. 14.)
   b. Worthlessness of an inoperative faith (ver. 15–17): to the needy (ver. 15, 16), to the professor of it. (Ver. 17.)
   c. True faith must have works (ver. 18–26): else there is no evidence of its existence (ver. 18); nor any strength and blessedness in the experience of professors. (Ver. 19). Confirmation from Abraham's example (ver. 20–24); and Rahab's. (Ver. 25, 26.)

II. Division.—Amid trials and temptations, the godly should be slow to speak. Warning against sins of the tongue, and the collisions and offences to Christian charity and fellowship thence arising. (3: 1–12.)

1. *Those transgressing in this particular will be severely judged.* (3: 1, 2.)
2. *Grounds of the judgment.* (Ver. 3–12.)
   a. The wonderful power of the tongue. (Ver. 3–6.)
   b. The power of man, Nature's lord, to rule it. (Ver. 7–12.)

III. Division.—Amid trials and temptations, the godly should be slow to wrath, and also its kindred impulsive passions. (3: 13; 4: 17.)

1. *Gentleness and moderation of Christian wisdom depicted.* (3: 13–18.)
2. *Warning against the sway of the passions.* (4: 1–17.)
   a. Their evil consequences (ver. 1–3): they engender strife (ver. 4: 1), they are illusory (ver. 2), and they deprive prayer of its efficacy (ver. 3).
   b. *Ungodliness of the passions* (ver. 4–6): they involve enmity to God (ver. 4), and oppose his word (ver. 5, 6).
   c. Means to overcome these desires. (Ver. 7–10.)
   d. Warning against the presumption they inspire (ver. 11–17): in men's estimates (ver. 11, 12), in their secular projects (ver. 13–17).

Conclusion.—Duties of the tempted and tried recapitulated and reinforced. (5: 1–20.)

1. *Swiftness to hear.* (Ver. 1–11.) Let them heed the assurances of the word in regard to the speedy end of all their present complications: the future it forecasts for prosperous wickedness (ver. 1–6), and for afflicted piety (ver. 7–11).
2. *Slowness to speak.* (Ver. 12–18.) Let them use the gift of the tongue piously, hence, not in swearing (ver. 10), but in prayer (ver. 13–18), which must be seasonable (ver. 13), intercessory (ver. 14–16), and trustful (ver. 16–18).
3. *Slowness to wrath.* (Ver. 19, 20.) Let Christ's people, instead of contending with injurious men, seek to save them.

Note.—It would perhaps be esteemed a display of pedantry should the writer of this brief Commentary give a list of the numerous works consulted in its preparation. He needs only say that he has availed himself of the aid afforded by the best authorities, and has used all the diligence in coming to correct conclusions which a career of manifold occupation would allow. Yet he must be permitted to express his special obligations to the learned labors of Winer in the department of New Testament grammar, of Huther in interpretation, and of Lisco in analysis. He is also indebted to Bengel's fruitful hints, and Johnstone's and Plumptre's popular expositions, and, among historical works, to Neander' "Planting and Training of the Church," and to Stanley's "Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age." Only the necessarily contracted limits of the present work have prevented its author's drawing more largely from these rich stores. And he must add, in conclusion, that he has derived no little encouragement and aid from the scholarly criticisms and acute suggestions of Prof. Thomas J. Dill, of Howard College, who must, however, be held, in no respect, as responsible for the conclusions to which the author has arrived.

THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JAMES.

CHAPTER I.

JAMES, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad, greeting.

1 James, a [1] servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are of the Dispersion, [2] greeting.

1 Gr. *bondservant*.....2 Gr. *wisheth joy.*

Ch. 1: 1-18. THE GREETING AND THE OCCASION OF THE EPISTLE.

1. James, the author of this Epistle, was not the son of Alphæus, but a full brother of the Lord, whose name occurs in the family list. (Matt. 13: 55, 56; Mark 6: 3.) Nor was he one of the twelve apostles; for he was not even a disciple at the time when the number of these "witnesses of the resurrection" was made up. (John 6: 70; 7: 5.) He did not possess the qualifications which the disciples regarded as necessary for the apostolic office (Acts 1: 21, 22), and therefore could not have been elected by them to the apostleship after our Lord's ascension. Nor have we any evidence that James was miraculously designated to that office, as Paul was. Further, James did not claim the dignity, as the apostles were wont to do. (Rom. 1: 1; 1 and 2 Cor. 1: 1; Gal. 1: 1; Titus 1: 1; 1 Peter 1: 1.) Nor, finally, did he perform the proper apostolic work: he was not *sent forth* to testify to the resurrection of Jesus, but remained at Jerusalem, where he was held in honor as the Lord's brother (Gal. 1: 19), and as an eminent saint, and where he presided over the church until A. D. 62 or 63, when he suffered martyrdom. See Introduction I.

A servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ—literally, *a bondsman.* Here the whole phrase indicates a person subject to the divine government, employed by God for the performance of his will, holding himself at the divine disposal, and devoted in particular to the extension of the gospel of Christ among men. The lowest service to God is honorable. The title was not official, but was applied not only to apostles (Acts 4: 29; Rom. 1: 1), but to preachers, teachers, and to the disciples in general. (Acts 2: 18; Eph. 6: 6.) All the Lord's people are servants, bearing his name, representing him in example, testimony, and advocacy, and doing his will. 'God and the Lord Jesus Christ' are mentioned together to indicate the harmony of both the dispensations of revealed religion—the Old, which recognized God as the sovereign of Israel; and the New, which acknowledged the Lord Jesus Christ as the Head of the Church. (James 2: 1.) The reverence of James for both would conciliate the good will of those whom he addressed. (Acts 26: 6, 7.) It is observable that the name of Jesus Christ occurs but once again in this Epistle. (James 2: 1.) The omission suggests the modesty and discretion of the writer, who would not even seem to urge any claim to consideration on the score of his natural relationship to Jesus. (2 Cor. 5: 16; Mark 10: 43-45.) A union with Christ in service and spirit is the only relationship that abides.

To the twelve tribes that are scattered abroad—literally, "to the twelve tribes in the Dispersion." See John 7: 35. The Syriac Version adds, "among the Gentiles." Hackett: "The Jewish nation consisted of those who were descended from the twelve tribes, which fact justified the expression historically, though the twelve tribes had now lost their separate existence. Many of the Israelites who had been led away in the Assyrian and Babylonian Captivity never returned to Palestine. They settled among the Gentiles, engaged in various avocations, and maintained their national traditions and synagogue worship. These centres of religious truth and influence prepared the heathen for Christianity. And the Jews abroad were more accessible to the gospel than the communities in Palestine, which were set against Christianity by persecuting rulers, and were prejudiced by the imposing ritual service at Jerusalem. Hence the special efforts put forth by apostles and evangelists to win the tribes 'in the Dispersion.'" Yet our Epistle was not exclusively addressed to the Jews in foreign countries, or even to the Christians among them; for those in Palestine were also in dispersion, the old tribal limits having been broken in every direction. Probably

2 My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations;

2 Count it all joy, my brethren, when ye fall into 3 manifold [1]temptations; knowing that the proving of

[1] Or, *trials*.

the address was from the head of the church at Jerusalem to all the Jewish converts outside of the metropolis, especially to the members of the Church who had been scattered by persecution, and had fled to Judea, Samaria, Phenice, Cyprus, and Antioch. Acts 8: 1; 11: 19; compare 1 Pet. 1: 1. Some of the dispersed spoke Greek only—hence they were called Hellenists (Acts 9: 29); others spoke the Aramean. Jahn "Arch." § 324. That the former were by far the larger class, may be inferred from the fact that James' letter to the dispersed Jews was written in Greek. Upon the extent of the Dispersion, see comment on James 4: 13. **Greeting**—*wishes joy*. A salutation common among the Greeks, and familiar to James also. See Acts 15: 23. The usual Hebrew salutation was "Peace." The term here adopted corresponds with the design of the Epistle, and prepared its readers for the call to "joy" in the next verse. The preacher brought to the tried and tempted a message of consolation and cheer, thus performing his pastoral work as "the minister of the circumcision." (Gal. 2 9.) He wrote to them in the language in common use among the remoter tribes in the Dispersion, thus fulfilling the promise that God's favor would follow his exiles. (Ezek. 11: 16.)

2-18. OCCASION OF THE EPISTLE.

The trials and temptations of the Jewish Christians, which called for exhortations to steadfast, prayerful, and patient endurance. Here two divisions occur: I. (2-12). Exhortation to cheerful steadfastness under persecutions and other outward trials; II. (13-18). Call to Christians to resist the temptations by which they were beset.

1) In the exhortation to patience under trials the following is the train of thought: 1 (ver. 2-4). Believers have reason to rejoice amid their manifold conflicts and afflictions; 2 (ver. 5-8). Superiority to affliction may be obtained by prayer, which endows the soul with a lofty and otherwise unattainable wisdom; 3 (ver. 9-12). Another help to heroic steadfastness in trial is a correct estimate of the external condition of life and also of the results of trials borne in a Christian spirit.

a. **2-4.** Believers have reason to rejoice amid their manifold conflicts and afflictions.

2. My brethren—a favorite expression with James. It marks most of the paragraphs of the present Epistle, as ver. 19, 2: 1, 14; 3: 1; 4: 11; 5: 7, 9, 12, 19. Characteristically it was altered in the beginning of his address at the Jerusalem Conference. (Acts 15: 13.) The allusion was not to the common descent of the Jewish Christians, but to that new relation of sympathy and serviceableness which believers sustain to each other; all had alike a share in the welfare and administration of the Church. Comp. Baumgarten "Ap. Hist.," Acts 15: 23. Another reason, besides that given in ver 1, for writing the Epistle: it was sent by a servant of the Lord, and a brother in the Christian family. **When ye fall into divers** (*manifold*) **temptations.** Syriac: "Many and various trials." Here the occasion of writing the Epistle appears. The Jewish Christians were beset with various temptations, against whose depressing and seductive influence they needed to be warned. That the trials referred to were more than troubles and persecutions, is suggested by the use of a kindred word in ver. 13, where internal temptations are indicated. The term here, however, is intended to suggest the whole theme in the mind of the writer, while at the same time it is limited in its present application by "fall into," so as to be surrounded by (*περιπέσητε*), as the traveler in the parable "fell among" thieves. (Luke 10: 30.) In classic Greek the verb applies to difficulties and contests. Accordingly the 'temptations' here introduce the whole subject, while yet they are, in some sort, a contrast to those indicated in ver. 13. They are rather the temptations that environ us than those that dwell within us. They are the trials arising from the conflicts, sufferings, and troubles encountered by believers in a sin-stricken and hostile world. Luke 8: 13 compared with Matt. 13: 21. Thus they are 'manifold,' embracing all the relations of life, in any of which the Christian may be tempted to apostasy or despair. Hence, they are of various forms and many kinds. (2 Cor. 6: 4 seq.; 11: 23 seq.) Besides the trials common to all men,

3 Knowing *this*, that the trying of your faith worketh patience.
4 But let patience have *her* perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing.

4 your faith worketh [1]patience. And let [1]patience have *its* perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, lacking in nothing.

1 Or, *steadfastness*.

Christians are exposed by their principles and profession to others peculiar to themselves. **Count it all joy.** An allusion to the greeting of joy in ver. 1, which must have awakened surprise, and which accordingly James now proceeds to explain and justify. Joy is used metonymically for a cause or matter of rejoicing. 'All joy,' entire joy; the idea is akin to that of 2 Cor. 4: 17, where suffering is represented as belittled by its glorious results; here it is represented as quite done away. There is "a joy of battle" when there is an assurance of victory. The beneficial effects of each trouble, steadfastly endured, more than compensate for the immediate pain it inflicts. (Heb. 12: 11.) Under the gospel, trials change their character; they are an exercise of fortitude, a rich contribution to experience, a test of the consolations of the Spirit, a call to trust in God, and to pity and pardon toward men, and a preparation for heaven. Thus each trial becomes to the Christian mind the discipline of a Father's hand, and an occasion for joy and thanksgiving; it ceases to be affliction; it is all joy. See an illustration and list of the trials over which faith may triumph, 2 Cor. 11: 24–28.

3. Knowing this introduces the warrant, at least in part, of the previous exhortation. The inspired writers frequently appeal to the knowledge which Christians may derive either from experience or the gospel promises, as an argument for steadfastness. (1 Cor. 15: 58; Col. 3: 24; 4: 1; Heb. 10: 34, etc.) The participle is closely connected with the imperative of the previous verse, and shares its meaning: "you ought to know this." **That the trial of your faith**—*the proving of your faith.* Cremer: the verification of faith. The trying of faith not only indicates the testing of its quality, but also the happy results of that test (compare 1 Peter 1: 7, the only other passage in which the word occurs), for the writer proceeds on the supposition that the trial will be borne Christianly: a genuine faith exposed to the fires of affliction (Rom. 5: 3, 4) will be as furnace-proven gold. Thus gloomy night brings out the stars. Faith here does not signify the doctrine of Christ, but that confidence in the gospel of Jesus Christ which is the centre of Christian character, and the necessary foundation of Christian conduct. **Worketh patience**—or *constancy;* the effect of the trial. (Rom. 5: 3.) The Syriac reads: "Maketh you possess patience." This virtue is earnestly commended by our Lord. (Matt. 10: 22; 24: 13.) It is closely connected with hope, both in the Septuagint and the New Testament. See 2 Thess. 3: 5; Rev. 3: 10; Rom. 15: 5, 13. Hope is the ground of constancy; hence, the words are used interchangeably. Here, however, James deals with patience only as it is a part of the Christian character. The tried believer not only endures in this or that instance, but he acquires the power of endurance, a manly robustness of spirit. (Luke 21: 19.) A personal conviction of the power of faith, a clear conscience, and a cheerful expectation impart constancy, and so prepare the tempted soul for new conflicts and new victories. Patience is too passive a term to express at once the voluntary and daily endurance of hardships and outrages for religion's sake, and also the steadfast maintenance of a pious course of life notwithstanding these difficulties; hence, the word is translated in Rom. 2: 7, "patient continuance." Such was the spirit of the disciples who, after having been scourged on account of their fidelity to Christ, "departed from the presence of the Council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name." Acts 5: 40, 41; compare 1 Peter 4: 16; consult note on James 5: 8, De Wette. The thought is not pursued as in the parallel passage, 1 Peter 1: 7; instead of encouraging Christian hope as Peter does, James adds an admonition. (Ver. 4.)

4. But let patience have her (*a*) **perfect work.** The scope of the duty now under consideration; the constancy now to be displayed under affliction will have other occasions also for its exercise and must be maintained even to the end of life. (Neander's "Planting and Training of the Christian Church," B. vi. Ch. 3.) Thus must its work be perfected and its glorious career be accom-

5 If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all *men* liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him.

5 But if any of you lacketh wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all liberally and upbraideth not;

plished. (2 Tim. 4: 7.) Constancy is not simply a negative virtue, a mere submission and resignation under calamity, like an immovable rock amid the waves: it is inspired by hope (2 Thess. 3: 5), and is diligent in the performance of good works (Rom. 2: 7; 2 Cor. 12: 12), like a soldier familiar with hardships and perils, and pressing on to the conquest of new fields. **That ye may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing**—*lacking in nothing.* Here again the effect on character is indicated. Bengel: "The perfect work is followed by the perfect man." See this illustrated in the case of the approved preacher (2 Tim. 2: 15), and in that of Abraham (James 2: 22), whose faith was made perfect by works. That (*to the end that*) indicates that this ennoblement of nature and enlargement of energy should be had in view, and diligently striven after by the Christian sufferer. 'Perfect and entire' are synonyms; both terms were applied to sacrifices, but there is nothing to show such a reference here; 'perfect' is properly what has attained its aim, 'entire' what is complete in all its parts. Suffering believers should seek to be perfect in the development of character, and entire in the discharge of the duties allotted to their several spheres in life. When this end should be attained they would be 'lacking in nothing' either as respects the moral nature or the conduct. In its proper signification, the word would be 'lagging behind,' *i. e.*—behind the aim set before Christians—a sharp contrast to 'perfect' which attains the goal. The Jews needed the exhortation, to prepare them for the approaching days of trial, but as a nation they did not steer toward the Christian ideal; hence they were left behind by other nations and stranded in history. That absolute perfection, however, is not attained by any in this life, James teaches, when he says that in many things we all offend. James 3: 2; compare 2: 13. Yet so much the greater the necessity of keeping the highest aim in view. (Heb. 6: 1; 2 Peter 1: 5-8.)

b. **5-8.** The support of cheerful constancy is found in prayer, through which a wisdom unattainable by nature is secured.

5. Whence it is to be sought. "But" is in the original, although it has been unfortunately left out in the beginning of this verse in the Common Version. James meets an objection or complaint which the reader might naturally urge: "You set before me an impossible aim; the work of moral perfection is too hard; cases occur which demand a superior judgment to distinguish between right and wrong. (Phil. 1: 10; Rom. 12: 2; Col. 4: 5.) To this practical difficulty, the text is a reply. **If any of you lack wisdom**—is *wanting in*, properly, is *left behind by*, more literally, *come short of.* Prayer is the necessary and efficient resort of those not in the condition referred to in ver. 4; of those who are consciously wanting in Christian wisdom; who are below the Christian ideal; whose feebleness in faith and constancy (ver. 3), and whose imperfection in character and conduct (ver. 4), are disclosed by the ordeal of trials. Among the Gentiles, wisdom was the favorite theme of philosophy and rhetoric. (1 Cor. 1: 17.) But no one imagined that the ideal man of philosophy could be found, or undertook to apply the stoical precepts to his own case. (Cicero "Tusc. Quests." 2: 22; Epictetus. "Disc." 2: 19, 24.) On the contrary a want of correspondence with the higher law was defended as "naturally and divinely justifiable." (Von Harless' "System of Christian Ethics," § 12.) Among the Jews wisdom was practical; it embraced what a man should know, what he should be, and what he should do. "Behold the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom, and to depart from evil is understanding." Compare the praises of wisdom in Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the book of Jesus Sirach. The wisdom enjoined by James must not be restricted to the circumstances of the present case. It is the cause of the perfect work (ver. 4), the solid foundation of Christian conduct: for it is "that spiritual discernment rooted in faith, living, urging to action in whatever relates to the life mission of Christians, as well in general as in particular crises; hence also in persecutions (ver. 2), which would otherwise be changed into inner temptations, instead of being the way to perfection." (Huther and Brückner.) **Let him ask of God**—by whom alone it can be given

6 But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering: for he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed.

6 and it shall be given him. But let him ask in faith, nothing doubting: for he that doubteth is like the 7 surge of the sea driven by the wind and tossed. For

(Prov. 2: 6), and who has promised to bestow this supernatural gift (James 3: 15, 17) upon such as seek it by the prayer of faith. (Ver. 6; James 5: 13 seq.) When nature fails amid the sharp conflicts of life, help to the struggling, aspiring soul is afforded by a Power above nature—a power kindly accessible and efficient—the primal fountain of light and love. (1 John 5: 15.) A sense of spiritual poverty is a blessing when it leads the humbled soul to God; the more deeply the tree is rooted in the ground, the higher it lifts its top into the sunlight. **That giveth to all men liberally.** In the original 'men' does not occur, and it is not needed in the translation: 'that giveth' is a participle agreeing with 'God.' The sense of the passage would be expressed by a repetition, 'the giving God that giveth,' etc. He is the giving One. Prayer for the supply of our needs is encouraged by God's cordiality in giving—by the temper and the policy of the King of heaven. "That giveth to all," not only to those who ask aright (Bengel) or even ask at all; so great is his loving fatherly care! He giveth "simply" or "freely," as the Syriac reads. The rendering of ἁπλῶς by liberally is incorrect. The idea is that God's gifts are not ostentatious, or interested, or embarrassed with conditions, exceptions, or counter demands, as the gifts of the rich (ver 10) were wont to be; but that they are granted from a pure desire to bless. (Matt. 6: 22; Rom. 12: 8.) **And upbraideth not.** This does not repeat the same thought in a negative form (Winer), but indicates a new feature in the mode of the divine giving, which does not offensively recall the benefits already given, or rebuke the applicant who asks for more. Not unfrequently the rich giver reproaches the poor for their folly, improvidence, and sloth, and so makes his gifts humiliating and detested. God, on the contrary, neither bargains with the suppliant, nor rails against him—he *gives*. **And it shall** (*will*) **be given him.** Another encouragement to the petitioner is afforded by the direct promise of a favorable response to his application. God has pleasure in giving to all; but he "is rich unto all that call upon him." (Rom. 10: 12; Matt. 7: 7.) The clause is impersonal and the principle it asserts is general (1 John 5: 14), the object for which prayer is made being put in the background; and yet no doubt there is a special reference here to the wisdom needed and implored by believers in trial. Compare Solomon's prayer for wisdom, and the gracious answer. (1 Kings 3: 9-12; 2 Chron. 1: 10-12.)

6. From ver. 6-8 we have shown how wisdom is to be sought; what the character of acceptable prayer must be. **But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering**—*doubting*. The Greek word for 'but' (δέ), like the German *aber*, is used in particular where an explanation is annexed, whether as an integral part of the sentence, or as a complete sentence, as here. (Winer.) It indicates that the thought is pursued, as also does the injunction, 'Let him ask,' which is repeated from ver. 5. Trust in God is indispensable to right and acceptable prayer; the 'faith' which, relying upon God's power, good will, and faithfulness, assures itself of a gracious answer. James magnifies the office of faith here, as the condition of acceptance with God. Compare Mark 11: 24; Matt. 21: 21; Mark 11: 23; Rom. 4: 20. Nor does he contradict himself when, in the subsequent chapter, he vindicates its practical character. 'Nothing doubting' (*doubting not at all*) expresses the same idea as 'in faith,' but strengthens it by putting it in a negative form. Compare Rom. 4: 20: "(Abraham) staggered not (*wavered not*) at the promise of God through unbelief, but was strong in faith, giving glory to God." See Matt. 21: 21. Doubt is the conflict of belief and unbelief, in which unbelief is gaining ground. Hermas: "Remove thy doubting, and thou needest not doubt in asking anything from God." **For he that wavereth** (*doubteth*) **is like a wave of the sea, driven with the wind and tossed.** 'For' (γάρ) may occur several times in succession with a change of reference; in such passages it often gives the ground of a series of separate thoughts, subordinate one to another. (Winer.) One dissuasive against doubting is derived from the character of the doubter, which has no stability, but is swayed by external circumstances: this is compared to a wave of the sea. There can be no peace or constancy, whic

7 For let not that man think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord.
8 A doubleminded man *is* unstable in all his ways.

let not that man think [1]that he shall receive any
8 thing of the Lord; a doubleminded man, unstable
9 in all his ways. But let the brother of low degree

1 Or, *that a double-minded man, unstable in all his ways, shall receive any thing of the Lord.*

comes from wisdom, in a spirit inconstantly fluctuating here and there, now swelling with hope, now sinking into despondency, as fortune changes. (Isa. 57: 20, 21.) Only when the tempted soul cleaves firmly to God can it be tranquil, secure, and triumphant. Then faith, itself unmoved, moves mountains. (Matt. 21: 21.) The wind-tormented billow, aimlessly moving to and fro, is a lively picture of the unrest of a doubting soul. During the residence of Mary's family at Capernaum, on the Sea of Galilee, James often beheld the natural phenomenon which he here refers to—that sheet of water being often disturbed by violent tempests, such as the one Bartlett describes in his "Footsteps of Our Lord and His Apostles." First the cool breeze rushed down the ravines that lead to the lake, and began to ruffle its placid bosom. "As it grew darker, the breeze increased to a gale, the lake became a sheet of foam, and the white-headed breakers dashed proudly on the rugged beach; its gentle murmur was now changed into the wild and sorrowful sound of the whistling wind and the agitated waters. Afar off was dimly seen a little barque, struggling with the waves, and then lost sight of amidst the misty rack." Comp. Matt. 8: 24. James had himself been a doubter (until after the resurrection of Jesus), and could therefore describe this class from his own experience. (Neander's "Planting," etc., p. 326.) A similar expression is found in Heb. 13: 9: "Be not *carried about* with divers and strange doctrines." In like manner Jude describes this class as "wandering stars" (ver. 13), and "clouds driven by the winds." (Ver. 12.)

7. Another reason for the warning of ver. 6—the prayers of the doubter will not be heard. **Let not that man think.** Thus the hope that God's favor may be secured by something merely external is denounced; see a similar expression in Matt. 3: 9—'Think not.' The expression, 'that man,' breathes contempt. "Such a man as that shall have nothing given to him." **That he shall** (*will*) **receive anything from the Lord**—that is, of the things prayed for. He may share with others in such benefits as the Lord, the giver of all good, bestows and scatters with indiscriminating bounty (ver. 5); but he shall receive nothing in answer to prayer. Hence, the spiritual blessing of wisdom is unattainable by the doubter.

8. A double-minded man (is) unstable in all his ways. The verb 'is' (which is not in the Greek) should not occur in the translation; for both 'double-minded man' and 'unstable in all his ways' are in apposition to 'that man,' in ver. 7 (so in the Syriac), and explain why no blessing is imparted in such a case. The characteristics of the doubter have already been exhibited in a figure (ver. 6); he is now plainly described both as to his spirit and his conduct. 'A double-minded man'—such, in character, is the doubter. He has, as it were, two souls contending with each other—the one turned to God, the other turned away from God, and hence to the world; he wishes to be the friend of God and the friend of the world at the same time, although the friendship of the world is enmity to God. (James 4: 4.) This was the cause of Solomon's defection. (1 Kings 11: 6.) He wavers between faith and unbelief. Hence, he is unprepared to receive the blessings he asks, or even to offer the kind of prayer upon which the gift is conditioned. Double-mindedness is neither the ground of the wavering (Wiesinger), nor its result (Lange), but its characteristic spirit. (Huther.) See note on James 4: 8. 'Unstable in all his ways.' The outer conduct will correspond with the internal discord. The double-minded man, yielding now to this inclination or motive, now to that, is fickle and unreliable in his undertakings and acts. (Ps. 91: 11; Jer. 16: 17; Prov. 3: 6.) As Jesus Sirach (2: 12) says: "He walks upon two roads." This discord both in the inner and outer life prevents the reception of the heavenly gift of wisdom. Only a heart single and sincerely devoted to God may expect his spiritual blessings. (Matt. 6: 22.) Adams (on 2 Peter) quaintly describes such a person as an ill-broken horse having no pace, and a bat which has both wings and teeth, but is neither beast nor bird (p. 488). The adjective is applied by Hippocrates to fevers which observe no

9 Let the brother of low degree rejoice in that he is exalted:
10 But the rich, in that he is made low: because as the flower of the grass he shall pass away.

10 glory in his high estate: and the rich, in that he is made low: because as the flower of the grass he shall

periods, and by Demosthenes to variable winds.

c. **9-12.** Another help to heroic steadfastness in trials is a correct estimate of the external and spiritual conditions of men, and also of the results of trials endured in a Christian spirit.

The two extremes of Christian social life are here designated—that of the poor (ver. 9), and that of the rich. (Ver. 10, 11.) The exhortation in ver. 12 is addressed to both. All classes are embraced by Christianity. (2: 11; 5: 13.)

9. (But) **let the brother of low degree.** 'But,' which the English Version omits, is important as showing that the writer brings into contrast the state of the lowly brother whom God exalts, with that of the waverer (ver. 8), for whom there is no hearing at the mercy seat. The title 'brother,' indicating the intimacy and tenderness of the Christian relation, is considerately applied to the poor, rather than to the rich. (Ver. 10.) The 'low degree' refers to poverty; and this not only as imposing limitations and cares from which affluence is exempt, but as exposed to worldly reproach and carnal temptations, prejudicial to steadfastness. It indicates Christians who live at once in a state of poverty and a time of persecution. Huther makes the expression indicate the Christian in his entire lowly condition in the world, as one contemning riches, rejected by the world, inwardly troubled, and walking in humility before God; but this is to spiritualize the text, rather than to interpret it. That the poor *in spirit* have the kingdom of heaven is true (Matt. 5: 3), but that truth is not asserted here. **In that he is exalted**—*glory in his exaltation*—the Christian dignity now possessed and hereafter to be displayed. The elevated thought that the poor saint is now a son of God, and that he has an inheritance of glory, will prove a safeguard against despondency, and under trial and privation. Let him estimate his privileges at their true value, and he will find therein consolation, strength, and joy. The figure in this and the following verses is an *oxymoron*, where the words or phrases are apparently contradictory; but, in fact, are congruous, because used in different senses. In Scripture, the *oxymoron* usually, if not always, displays in a lively manner the contrast between natural and spiritual conditions. So in 1 Cor. 7: 22. "The servant" (*bondsman*) called in the Lord, is the Lord's freeman, the freeman called, is Christ's bondsman." (Weisinger.) "He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." (Matt. 10: 39.) This figure was more common anciently than it now is. In the spirit of James, Chrysostom says: "Scatter, that thou mayest not lose; keep not, that thou mayest keep; lay out, that thou mayest save; spend, that thou mayest gain." In verses 9, 10, the subject of the sentence indicates believers in their secular and civil state; the object indicates their spiritual condition.

10. But the rich in that he is made low—literally, *in his humiliation*. After 'rich,' *brother* is to be supplied, as it is expressed after 'poor' in the parallel member of the sentence. In such a connection, both the adjectives, 'poor' and 'rich' (ver. 9, 10), which answer the one to the other, must have the same noun, "brother," and to each of these nominatives the same verb, 'let (*him*) glory,' must serve. Any other construction would be strained and unnatural. Difficulties of interpretation must not be allowed to disturb the grammatical order, and pervert the plain meaning of the text: 'But let the rich brother glory in his humiliation.' The rich brother, in the Dispersion, was exposed to persecution as well as the poor brother. Although now favored of fortune, and abounding in worldly goods, he was in danger of losing his possessions, on account of his adherence to the gospel. And the rich brother in the church (compare 1 Tim. 6: 17-19) needed the resources of heavenly wisdom as well as others. The cause of his glorying was that riches had, in his estimation, ceased to have any substantial value. What gave him worldly distinction and splendor had lost its glory, having been eclipsed by the nobler blessings he possessed as a Christian; he had the same high dignity

11 For the sun is no sooner risen with a burning heat, but it withereth the grass, and the flower thereof

11 pass away. For the sun ariseth with the scorching wind, and withereth the grass; and the flower there-

as that imparted to his needy and now suffering brother—a glory independent of all secular conditions, superior to reproach (2 Sam. 6: 22) and to pain. (2 Cor. 12: 9.) He was humbled, yet exalted in recognizing the vanity of all earthly glory. **Because as the flower of the grass** (*a flower of grass*) **he shall** (*will*) **pass away.** This is the ground of appeal to the rich brother to rejoice in his humiliation. He has been released from dependence upon the earthly pomp and fortune, which, as a disciple of Christ, he must expect to lose. Soon he will cease to be distinguished from the poor of the believing company; as a rich brother he will 'pass away,' he will cease to be. As the flower which gives beauty to the grass soon withers, so in his case whatever decorates the earthly life will certainly disappear. 'Flower' does not here indicate the bud or shoot, as in Isa. 11: 1 (Septuagint), but the bloom itself. The figure, which is further developed in ver. 11, occurs also frequently in the Old Testament. It indicates the fortune of man in general. (Job 14: 1.) He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down. (Isa. 40: 6, 7; Ps. 103: 15; 1 Peter 1: 24.) But, what is especially observable, this comparison, which is used in the Old Testament to depress the pride of the ungodly, is here employed to sustain the courage of believers.

Note.—These verses (9, 10) show how unchristian is the union of Church and State, by which the arbitrary distinctions of earthly societies are sought to be perpetuated in the kingdom of God. For here it is intended that these accidents of wealth and rank shall disappear in the presence of a greater than earthly monarchs, and in the reception and enjoyment of prerogatives which the world cannot confer. (1 Cor. 16: 20; 1 Thess. 5: 26.) Here the rich and the poor meet together before the Lord—the Maker and the Redeemer of them all. In the fact that the poor man, rather than the rich, is called a brother, the genius of Apostolic Christianity finds expression. Says Quinet, in his "Roman Church and Modern Society," § IX: "In the ideal of the Christian Church, everything was done by the people: priests, deacons, bishops, became such by election, and, as it were, *sprang from the public conscience.* Now [among the Establishments] nothing in the Church is done by the people; never more through them is the voice of God interrogated. This is what authorizes me to say that the spirit of modern institutions, in replacing everything upon this basis of the public conscience, of the sovereignty of the people, is incontestibly in its principle nearer the Christian ideal, than is at the present day the organization and institution of the Church." Compare a modern Pastoral with an Apostolic Epistle; in the former, the Church, meaning the clergy, is always magnified; in the latter, the Christian brotherhood; in the former, we vainly seek for such an address as that of Paul to the Corinthians: "All the brethren salute you"; or that which James despatched in the name of the apostles and elders *and brethren* unto the brethren in Antioch. (Acts 15: 23.) The subject is worthy of comment, since it shows how profound is the chasm which separates the hierarchical churches from those founded by Christ's apostles. The policy of the Vatican, in its contest for temporal sovereignty and secular possessions, has no warrant in the New Testament.

11. For the sun is no sooner risen, etc. In the original, the illustration in this verse is given in the form of an incident, a past event of familiar observation. The verbs are in the aorist, which indicates facts that have already taken place, and these verbs coming together, as they do here, express the rapid succession of the events. (Winer.) Literally, the text would read: "*For the sun rose with the burning wind, and withered the grass; and the flower thereof fell off, and the grace of the fashion of it perished: so also will the rich fade away in his ways.*" This mode of expression gives vivacity to the picture (Isa. 40: 7) in the original; yet it cannot be transplanted without awkwardness into English. 'The sun rose with the burning heat.' The reference appears to be to the simoom—in Palestine an east wind, which comes arid and scorching from the Arabian deserts. It is often referred to in the Old Testament. (Hos. 12: 1; 13: 15; Jer. 18: 17; Ezek. 17: 16; Job 7: 21.) (Winer's "Realwörterbuch.) Grimm's and Huther's objection to this reference that the sun is here said to wither, and not the heat, does not avail; for what is effected by the winds attending

falleth, and the grace of the fashion of it perisheth: so also shall the rich man fade away in his ways.
12 Blessed *is* the man that endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him.

of falleth, and the grace of the fashion of it perisheth: so also shall the rich man fade away in his goings.
12 Blessed is the man who endureth temptation: for when he hath been approved, he shall receive the crown of life, which *the Lord* promised to them that
13 love him. Let no man say when he is tempted, I

the sunrise (Jonah 4: 8) may be referred to the sun itself; just as the ravages of an invading host are charged upon their leader. **So also shall the rich man fade away in his ways.** The ways are a figure for the manner of life; here they represent the projects and undertakings, the pomps and pleasures belonging to a state of earthly prosperity. Whatever temporal possession, whatever favorable external circumstance adorns the earthly life, will be withered by persecution. 'Also' emphasises the resemblance to the figure. As the flower which glorifies the grass drops off, and the beauty of its external appearance (Ps. 104: 30; Luke 12: 56; Matt. 16: 3) perishes in the hot blast of the desert, so also does the rich man, in the season of calamity, lose whatever distinguishes him from his fellows; and such experiences those believers who were now thriving in their possessions, activities, and enterprises, must expect to endure. These reverses of fortune are tragical only in the case of the wealthy unbeliever, who, in losing his wealth, loses everything. (Ps. 49: 5-20; Luke 12: 16-21; 16: 19-26.)

12. Encouragement both to those who are in depressed circumstances, and to those who will be reduced to that condition by the persecutions of the enemies of the gospel. What they prize most highly, their choicest good, is not exposed to any contingency, and will not fade away. This assurance of blessing concludes one of the trains of thought introduced in ver. 2. **Blessed is the man that endureth temptation**—who amid the tribulations occasioned by his Christian profession adheres to the duties of piety. The texts recalls Ps. 1, and unfolds its deeper meanings; as in that Psalm, (ver. 1) so here, there is no 'is' in the original; the omission in both cases strengthens the ascription. There is no emphasis upon 'the man,' as if the person in view were distinguished from soft and effeminate professors, who easily give way in trial; the emphasis rather falls upon 'endureth.' It is one thing to bear the cross, another to endure under the burden, in the ways and spirit indicated in ver. 3, 4, 9–11. Temptation refers to those various troubles and calamities, permitted by God for the purpose of testing the faith, piety, and virtue of his people. When temptations produce the intended effect, then they bring approval and reward. (Matt. 5: 11, 12.) **For when he is tried** (*approved*) **he shall receive the crown of life.** 'For' indicates the reason of the blessing. The believer who has patiently borne the ordeal of affliction, and who is 'approved' after due examination and trial of his case, will receive a glorious recompense of grace. It is not certain that either the contests of athletes, or the purification of metals by fire is here referred to, although both may be used in the way of illustration. The figure of reward is striking. 'The crown of life' is the same as "the crown"—*i. e.*, "life," the second noun being equivalent to an appositive according to a common usage, as when we say, "The city of New York," meaning only "the city, New York." There may here also be no reference to the reward of victors in the Greek games; as among the Jews a crown or diadem in itself suggested royal power or eminent glory. (Ps. 21: 3; Wis. of Sol. 5: 16, 17.) Life is the crown with which God's steadfast confessor will be adorned (Rev. 2: 10; 1 Peter 5: 4; 2 Tim. 4: 8)—that life which alone deserves the name, life spiritual from its beginning, and hereafter perfect, blissful, and eternal, and thus beyond the reach of human malice and temporal calamity; a blessing, to obtain which the persecuted Christian may joyfully consent to suffer and to die. **Which the Lord** (*he*) **hath promised to them that love him.** 'The Lord' is not in the original; read 'he,' referring not to Christ, but to God. The certainty of the reward is indicated by the fact that it is promised by the Sovereign of heaven. The divine engagements are unlike the promises of fickle fortune. (Ver. 10, 11.) Rewards are assured to those who endure trial from love to God, in contrast with the "double minded." (Ver. 8.) Love produces endurance; for those who love God appreciate the

13 Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man:

am tempted [1] of God: for God [2] cannot be tempted
14 with [3] evil, and he himself tempteth no man: but

1 Gr. *from*.....2 Or. *is untried in evil*.....3 Gr. *evil things*.

kindly wisdom that measures and controls the trials of life, and the blessed end to which these trials lead. Hence those who love the Lord, and those who endure temptation are the same. Compare Rom. 8: 28. In the theology of James, love is the essence of true faith; hence the repetition of this phrase. (James 2: 5.) Compare the whole passage with 2 Tim. 4: 8. "Henceforth there is laid up for me *the* crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous judge shall give me at that day; and not to me only but unto all them also that *love* his appearing."

2) **13-18.** *Exhortation to steadfast and patient endurance under temptation of sin.* It is natural to one swayed by temptation to vindicate himself by the plea of necessity, and to urge that circumstances, which God orders, have exercised an irresistible power over his intellect, his passions, or his will. James shows the futility of this plea by appealing to the nature of God (ver. 13)—to the experiences of men under temptation (ver. 14, 15)—and finally to the divine dispensations. (Ver. 16-18.)

a. Argument from the nature of God.

13. Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of (*from*) **God.** Here temptation is taken in the same sense as in the previous verses; but the attitude of the persons now considered is different from that of those previously addressed. Both classes are tempted to apostasy by the danger of death, of suffering, or of loss of goods. But the former endure temptation; the latter dally with it, and seek for grounds to justify them in yielding to its seductions or threatenings. Thus, what was a salutary trial in one case, becomes in the other case a motive and allurement to sin, through the unhallowed desires or criminal fears it has awakened. James indicates what apostates, in such a case, were wont to 'say'; 'I am tempted from God.' 'He it is who so orders these circumstances that I have no alternative but to give way.' This pretext was familiar, doubtless, to the Pharisees, who were fatalists (Josh. "Bell. Jud." 2: 8, 14), and was current among the Jewish people. "Wisd. of Jesus, son of Sirach," 15: 11-22. It is also the common resort of men everywhere to cast the blame of their sins upon providence. Hom. "Iliad" v. 86: "I am not in fault, but Jove and Fate." Plautus: "God drove me on." Perhaps the apostates perverted passages of the Old Testament, such as Exod. 9: 16. But on the contrary, as James had already insisted, God allows trial so as to make men better; the evil arising from it comes from another source; let no one trace it to him! **For God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man.** The first clause may signify either that God is untempted, or that he cannot be tempted; both amount to the same thing in this passage. The holiness of God disproves the pretext of the apostate; God is unversed in temptation, and even inaccessible to it. In his dealings, he acts according to his own nature, just as men do. Hence he has no experience of evils, cannot be contaminated with them, cannot be tempted by them. The conclusion follows that the origin of evil cannot be found in God. He *cannot* induce men to do what is wholly repugnant to his own nature and will.

NOTE.—In reference to the apparent contradiction of this text with other passages, it may be observed that where God is said to tempt men (Exod. 15: 25; Judg. 3: 1-4; 1 Cor. 10: 13), these passages signify that God tests men, not to allure to sin, but to give an opportunity of overcoming it, for which purpose he apportions the trial to the strength (1 Cor. 10: 13), and also gives the aid of his Holy Spirit (James 4: 6), the light of nature, the voice of conscience, and the warnings of his law. When blinding and hardening of heart are ascribed to God, the evil is the result of a trial abused. The work of temptation in its evil character is, already in the Book of Job, and more frequently in the New Testament, ascribed to Satan. (Matt. 4: 1; 1 Cor. 7: 5.) Yet not in such a sense that the blame of yielding to it may be shifted from ourselves. The idea that God is the Author of Sin, either through his decrees, or the circumstances in which he places us, or the desires and opportunities he gives us, or on account of his withholding restraining grace, is monstrous. All the expressions of his will, whether uttered in Scripture, or the system of

14 But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed.
15 Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.

each man is [1]tempted, when he is drawn away by
15 his own lust, and enticed. Then the lust, when it hath conceived, beareth sin: and the sin, when it is
16 fullgrown, bringeth forth death. Be not deceived,

1 Or, *tempted by his own lusts, being drawn away by it, and enticed.*

nature, or the general drift of his providence, proclaim that the wrong is harmful and unfit to be done. The free agency he bestows on men may indeed be perverted to wrongdoing; but it was bestowed as the necessary condition of virtue and piety; neither of which can exist without liberty of choice. Hence the existence of moral evil does not impugn either the benevolence or the holiness of God. He is not tempted with evil neither tempeth he any man. Seneca said (Ep. 95): "The gods can neither suffer wrong nor inflict it." How much wiser this heathen was than some who profess to be Christians!

b. Argument from the experiences of men. Ver. 14–15.

14. The efficient cause of sin is found, not in God, but in the evil heart of man. (Matt. 15: 19.) **Every man**—or, *each one*, is here antithetic to 'no man,' in the previous verse. **His own** is also expressive, standing in opposition to "he." (Ver. 13.) Whatever the circumstances of the case may be, that which allures men to sin (as fish or game are enticed by a bait, 3: 7) is within us, not without. It is 'lust,' an evil concupiscence (Rom. 7: 7), an inordinate love for sensual delights and worldly advantages; a disposition, temper, and habit of soul indocile to the purity of Christian truth, and the power of Christian motive. No suggestion of evil can mislead us until we embrace it. The inspired writer makes his representation more spirited by personifying Lust, Sin, and Death. The idea of a harlot (introduced by the amatory figures derived from the arts of hunting and fishing), is distinctly brought forward in the verbs "conceived" and "brought forth." (Ver. 15.) As the fish or game is drawn out from its place of security, and is enticed into the snare or net, so by the harlot Lust the man is drawn to herself; that he is captured is implied in his being enticed. See 2 Peter 2: 14, 18, where the same word occurs in the Greek. 'Drawn away' implies movement; 'enticed' implies state. Compare Ps. 1: 1, where the successive stages of progress in sin are represented by walking, standing, and sitting.

NOTE.—The manner in which James describes the operations of man's free agency in its abuse, is almost paradoxical. The desire for the forbidden object—the gold which attracts the covetous, the beauty which attracts the sensual—is the man's own; yet no sooner is it encouraged, than it becomes alien and malignant to its possessor—a net to catch in the path of error, a hook that pierces the eager tongue through the bait of pleasure. The same idea is involved in the familiar word "habit"—first the man has the habit, and then the habit has the man.

15. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin. Then the transition from the sinful desire to the sinful act is described. The figure of ver. 14 is retained, and is pursued, so as to show the fruit proceeding from the meretricious enticement. When the evil inclination is not promptly suppressed, but, on the contrary, is cherished with pleasure (compare Gen. 3: 16), the will of the man is surrendered to it, and is impregnated by it. Sin follows the seduction as naturally as birth follows conception. The pampered sensuality which thus produces sin is itself sin, as in nature everything produces its own kind; yet the sin indicated here is external, whether apostasy or some other sort of sin. This natural history of temptation is related to show that temptation cannot come from God. As, both grammatically and rhetorically, Lust and Sin are feminine, neither of them should be represented by the neuter pronoun 'it.' The text would be more fitly rendered: 'Then Lust, having conceived, bringeth forth Sin.' **Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.** 'Sin' (in the first clause, without the article) indicates the general character of the fruit of lust, whatever its outward expression may be. James represents sin as something having its own life, and continually developing itself, and at length reaching maturity and exercising a supreme and destructive power over human nature. It was not to his purpose to draw any distinction here between the single finished deed—sin which incurs the sentence of death, and

16 Do not err, my beloved brethren.
17 Every good gift and every perfect gift is from | 17 my beloved brethren. Every good [1]gift and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the

1 Or, *giving.*

the completed course of sinning, the impious and wicked life which receives the award of perdition. In any case, sin, when it has attained its full form and strength, is the mother of death. The soul that has yielded to temptation suffers the loss of that life which is alone worthy of the name, and also the inner misery arising from sin, having its beginning on earth, and after the death of the body, enduring and increasing forever. Evil gives birth to evil; the evil desire is followed by the evil act, and this by death spiritual and eternal. The idea is not that men are made mortal by sin; for here death is the opposite of that life which God has promised to them that love him (ver. 12): it is eternal death. "The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life." Rom. 6: 23; compare James 5: 20. That temptation leads to death proves that it cannot proceed from God who is the Author of life. Yet it deserves to be added, as showing the harmony of ver. 14, 15 with ver. 13, that this order of the Divine Government, which connects sorrow and death with sin, also illustrates the goodness of God. The odiousness of sin thus displayed may aid the guilty in the work of repentance and reformation, may restrain the tempted, confirm the virtuous in good principles and habits, and urge the philanthropic to more vigorous efforts for the restoration of the fallen and the well being of their race. Peabody: "Christianity the Religion of Nature," p. 104.

c. Argument from the Divine Dispensations. Ver. 16–18.

16. Do not err, my beloved brethren. James thus introduces an additional proof that God is not the author of evil. He has been arguing that God's nature excludes the possibility, now he appeals to the great facts of his administration. God is the Author of all good. He is the fountain of the hopes that men cherish, and the blessings that they receive, not of the evils that they commit. 'Do not err.' The same formula occurs elsewhere after the denial of some false opinion, as in 1 Cor. 6: 9; 15: 33; Gal. 6: 7. It introduces an appeal to Christian consciousness and experience to confirm the writer's statement. In all the other passages it is translated in the Common Version, "Be not deceived." The warning was important here, because no falsehood can be more mischievous and impious than that which James was opposing. To regard God as the author of sin would be a rejection of the whole system of Christian faith and morals. 'My beloved brethren' not only shows the importance of the subject discussed, but also the affection of the writer. In warning, he sought to conciliate; and he assumed the tone of persuasion because he loved. So fatal an error needed to be corrected in language of solemn tenderness. And in appealing to the fraternal relation which unites believers to each other, he at the same time reminded his readers of the filial relation which they all sustained to the Head of the Christian family. To entertain doubts in regard to the goodness of God, would quench the filial spirit of reverence, gratitude, and love. Errors in religion cannot but affect the character and conduct; and most prejudicial of all are those errors which depress our trust in God.

17. The third proof that God is not the author of sin is derived from his abounding and continuous beneficence. If all good comes from God, temptation to evil cannot. This verse is antithetic to ver. 14, 15. As from lust comes sin, and then death, the perfected fruit of sin, so, on the other hand, proceeds from God the good and the perfect. **Every good gift and every perfect gift**—*boon.* This phrase forms a perfect hexameter, and may be the fragment of an early church hymn. The substantives are different in the original, although from the same verb: the first is the act of giving, in which resides the moral quality 'good'; the second rather indicates the boon itself—it is a free gift, which is 'perfect' as suited to the needs of its recipient, whether they be physical or spiritual. (Rom. 5: 16.) We must suppose more than natural gifts to be here referred to—not only providential bounties, but gifts of the Spirit, righteousness, peace, and joy. God's good gifts are the opposite of lust-engendered sins; and God's perfect gifts the opposite of sin-engen-

above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.
18 Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of his creatures.

Father of lights, with whom can be no variation, 18 neither shadow that is cast by turning. Of his own will he brought us forth by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of his creatures.

dered death. (Ver. 14, 15.) Divine in its origin is every blessing we desire, hold, or expect—whatever tends to completeness and happiness, whatever tends to righteousness and piety. This principle is the redeeming feature in Matthew Arnold's system. He describes the Hebrew intuition of God as the conception of the Eternal that makes for righteousness, and as a revelation needed to breathe emotion into the laws of morality, and to make morality religion. ("Literature and Dogma," p. 87.) **Is from above**—that is, from heaven, like the new birth of the human soul. (John 3: 3, margin.) With the text compare Acts 14: 17; John 6: 32. **And cometh down from the Father of lights**—literally, *coming down*, a participle complementary to the preceding clause, and emphasizing the thought that God is the Author of our blessings. 'The Father of lights'—literally, of *the lights*—that is, the heavenly orbs. (Ps. 135: 7; Jer. 4: 23.) God is called their Father, because he has created and ever sustains them. The light they shed is therefore a reflection of his. Their glory and beneficence are at once a religious argument and a divine revelation. (Isa. 40: 26; Ps. 147: 4.) Whatever they symbolize and express must be in their cause. Hence, nothing dark or evil can issue from him. (1 John 1: 5.) **With whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning** may be translated *with whom is no change or shadow from turning*. The reference is to the apparent revolutions of the heavenly bodies. They change their position, and they fall into obscurity and eclipse. There is nothing like this in God, whose transcendent glory is disturbed by no shadows (compare "Book of Wisdom" 7: 20; "Knapp's Theology," § 20), and whose nature, purposes, and dispositions are unchanging. He is entirely and unalterably good, and so transcends what is most admirable in creation. From such a being only good and perfect gifts can come. James recognized God as One who dwelt 'above' the trials and temptations of which he had been speaking, above the firmament whose blue depths are so oft beclouded, above the stars whose glory is so oft bedimmed; and adored him as the unchanging Father of lights, and as our Father in heaven (ver. 18), whose mercy endureth forever.

18. This verse gives a more convincing proof of God's purity; it is found in those spiritual creations which render him a higher glory than the orbs of light. The importance of the thought is shown by the fact that it crowns the exordium, and is the foundation on which the whole succeeding argument is built. **Of his own will begat he us.** 'Begat' is an allusion, by contrast, to ver. 15, where the same word is used in the original. It signifies a birth which is not according to the order of nature—there the monstrous progeny of lust and sin, here virtuous souls supernaturally generated by God (2 Peter 1: 4), and having more glory than the stars; the same creative power kindles the lights of earth and the lights of heaven. Moral darkness cannot proceed from such a being. His nature is contrary to evil. This appears also from the motive which engages in the new creation—his own will. The Syriac gives: "He saw fit and begat." Compare Eph. 1: 5. James teaches that regeneration is not the result of chance or caprice or fate, but of the free, deliberate will of God. (John 1: 13; 1 Peter 1: 23. See also "the good pleasure of his will," Eph. 1: 5.) The writer has Jewish Christians especially in view, as the sequel shows, but the principle applies to all believers. **With the word of truth.** The argument is strengthened by this addition. The means employed in regeneration is the truth, the pure and blessed gospel, revealing God's nature and will and the way of salvation. (Eph. 1: 13.) **That we should be a kind of firstfruits of his creatures.** The object of the work of creation was worthy of a holy God. He designed to produce *a higher style of creatures*, separated from the world, incorporated into his family, devoted to noble and immortal ends. According to the Jewish law, the first fruits, as the choice portion of the harvest, and as its symbol and pledge, were consecrated to God. (Num. 18: 12; Lev. 23: 10;

19 Wherefore, my beloved brethren, let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath:

19 [1]Ye know *this*, my beloved brethren. But let

1 Or, *know ye.*

Deut. 26: 2.) So with the first begotten of a family. (Deut. 21: 17; Gen. 49: 3.) Here James is not considering the state of Christians in general, but that of the early disciples whom he addressed, and who had received the first fruits of the Spirit. (Rom. 8: 23.) They were '*a kind of first fruits*' of the creation of God (the figure is modestly softened). All believers are his creatures in a special sense, as his workmanship (Eph. 2: 10) and his offspring. (1 John 3: 1, 2.) But the early believers were the chief and noblest part of the new creation, if not more holy and devoted than all the others, yet sanctifying them all. They were the earliest confessors and martyrs of the faith, and its only apostles. Like the peaks of the mountains, they first caught the light of the coming day that was to bless the whole world. The author of our Epistle was soon called to shed the sacred blood which should be the seed of the churches of the future. Those ancient saints were the first fruits of the gospel harvest. And as in Judea, the remaining harvest followed after the presentation of the first fruits, so should the salvation of believers ever extend more widely from this beginning. A powerful motive to them to endure in trial and temptation! In this text James renders a noble tribute to the gospel: it is the word of truth, and, as such, God's instrument of regeneration. Patterson: "Its divinity secures its truth, and both are satisfactorily proved by miracles performed and prophecies fulfilled; by the testimony of Christ and the martyrdom of the apostles; by the majesty of Scripture doctrine, and the purity of Scripture ethics; by the adaptation of both to the intellect, the conscience, and the heart, and by the practical effects which have followed in their train."

Note.—In this verse we think that the aorist would have been more appropriately translated by our perfect ("he *has begotten* us"), as has been done in the Common Version. (James 2: 5, 6; 5: 3, 5, 11.) Our perfect is a tense peculiarly appropriate in letters or speeches addressed by the living to the living in relation to matters within their common experience. For in the use of the perfect the speaker regards the action or condition, though past, as included within a period of time still present; and this he is permitted to do, if that action or condition is *connected with the present.* It may be thus connected either by the present existence of the subject, as, "I *have been* young, but now am old," or by the present continuance of the result, as, "Milton *has written* as noble works in prose as in poetry"; or by the present continuance of some attending circumstance of time or place, as, "Many important discoveries *have been made* in the present century"; "Upon this continent a great civil war *has been fought.*" It will be evident from these illustrations that the aorist will sometimes appear in Greek where our idiom more naturally employs the perfect. Nor is any violence done to the sense of the original by the change; for, as Winer observes, "It often depends upon the writer which of the two tenses he will use, as the difference between them is sometimes very slight." For this acute criticism upon a much-disputed point, we are indebted to Prof. T. J. Dill, of Howard College.

19, 20. Theme and Division of the Epistle.

19. This verse and the next exhibit the main divisions of the Epistle, which specify the characteristics of a child of God under trials and amid temptations. They show wherein is to be exercised the steadfastness which James has been commending in the general introduction to the Epistle. In particular the exhortation "to hear" refers to the "word of truth" (ver. 18), and is resumed and explained. (1: 21-2: 26.) The injunction in regard to restraint in speech is unfolded in chapter 3: 1–12. That in regard to the temper and spirit is developed in chapter 3: 13-4: 17. And the threefold division is recalled, as we shall see, in chapter 5.

Wherefore. This word is not justified by the highest authorities, which give instead, *ye know* or *know ye.* The imperative is more suitable, as a form of address (compare chap. 1: 16), but does not accommodate itself to the demands of the sentence. It should read:

20 For the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God.
21 Wherefore lay apart all filthiness and superfluity

every man be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to
20 wrath: for the wrath of man worketh not the right-
21 eousness of God. Wherefore putting away all filthi-

'*Ye know it, my beloved brethren; but let every man*, etc. Let your elevation in God's esteem (ver. 18) lead to the study of the word and improvement in virtue. The begotten of a holy God must themselves be holy; and to **every man** (contrast to 'no man,' ver. 13) the means of spiritual discipline is the performance of the duties here indicated. **My beloved brethren.** A mode of address common among early believers. (1 Cor. 15:58; 2 Peter 3:14.) Christian fellowship is helpful to the attainment of the ideal of the Christian life. The lessons here inculcated recall those of the Jewish sages. (Prov. 13:3; 14:29; Eccl. 5:2.) **Swift to hear**—the divine word is specially referred to; a ready reception of it and a cordial submission may well be indicated as the first duty of disciples. Fraternal counsel is implied. **Slow to speak** involves deliberation in judging as well as speaking in regard to life's trials, and in regard to the truth of God upon which human virtue and happiness depend. (Prov. 10:19.) "Speak neither against God, nor improperly of God—but for God." There was great freedom of exhortation and teaching in the early Church; James warns his readers that this involved grave responsibility. (Neander, "Planting and Training," p. 356.) **Slow to wrath.** Wrath is not simply displeasure; but active, passionate anger, which may manifest itself either in impatience under God's dealing, or vindictiveness under injuries and reproaches from men, or disputatious bitterness in maintaining what may be regarded as the truth. Compare chap. 3:13. 'Wrath' easily assumed in that day, as it does in ours, the guise of conscientiousness. Huther: "The warning points to Christians who used the gospel as the Pharisees did the Law, not for their sanctification, but for the satisfaction of their lust of condemning and contending." Compare chap. 3. The conduct of Christians in their assemblies is specially but not exclusively refered to.

20. This verse gives the ground of the warning, 'be slow to wrath.' As, in the original, the definite article is wanting in the two instances where it occurs in the English, the literal translation is: *For man's wrath worketh not God's righteousness.* **For the wrath of man.** Wrath is a powerful passion, and works effectively in secular and political affairs; it is, however, alien to the Christian society, and to the kingdom of God. (1 Tim. 2:8.) It is closely related, as the etymology shows, to the other impulsive passions, and is treated as their representative. (3:13-4:17.) **The righteousness of God** is that righteousness which pleases God, and which he requires. Compare Acts 4:19; Gal. 6:10. It is the opposite of the sin or iniquity which the unregenerate heart works. (Matt. 7:23; James 2:9.) Wrath cannot be pleasing to God; for there is no passionate violence in his nature; his law is love, and his cause is hindered by an intemperate zeal. The warning of our text was specially needed by the Jews, who had a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge (Rom. 10:2), and who thought that they were serving God by violent outbursts against those whom they regarded as sinners and heretics. (John 16:2.) A similar thought occurs in Eccl. 7:9, "Be not hasty in thy spirit: for anger resteth in the bosom of fools." Our text is more specific than Matt. 5:22. No emphasis falls upon the word **man**, as if the inspired writer were here warning against a passion more intense and constant than that of the child, and more vehement and violent than that of the woman. The principle applies to all classes and cases. Luther: "Anger and punishment are not prohibited when God's command and the necessity of the case require; but *wrath* which springs from personal impulse and passion, and which is a brief madness." By a spirit so contrary to its own the cause of Religion cannot be promoted. On the contrary, only a temper serene under injury and submissive in affliction, as it is of divine origin, is fitted to receive and propagate the truth. See next verse.

I. DIVISION, 21-2:26. THE GODLY IN TRIAL AND TEMPTATION MUST BE SWIFT TO HEAR.

1. *The word must be received as the inner law.* Ver. 21.

21. Wherefore lay apart (better, *putting off*, as a defiled garment) **all filthiness.** In this verse the exposition of the first division of the Epistle begins, the heed and honor to

of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls.
22 But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves.

ness and overflowing of [1]wickedness, receive with meekness the [2]implanted word, which is able to
22 save your souls. But be ye doers of the word, and
23 not hearers only, deluding your own selves. For if

1 Or, *malice*.....2 Or, *inborn*.

be accorded to the word. 'Wherefore' points back to the previous verse, and prepares for the injunction in regard to the manner of receiving the word. 'Filthiness' is the synonym of wickedness; the adjective is used in a similar figurative sense in Rev. 22: 11: "He that is filthy let him be filthy still." It represents sin as the defilement of human nature, and hence embraces, not only immorality, but wrath also. (Acts 15: 20; 1 Peter 3: 21.) **And superfluity of naughtiness**—that is, abundance or excess of maliciousness. The evil here condemned is that which is opposite to meekness, as the connection shows; it is the wickedness which finds expression and pleasure in injuries to others. (Eph. 4: 31. Col. 3: 8; Titus 3: 3.) It is the active hostility which disturbs Christian fellowship, and vitiates the inculcation of Christian truth. The evil which lurks within, and that which streams out into life, must be repressed and rejected, that there may be place and opportunity for the good to grow. (1 Peter 2: 1; Eph. 4: 22, 23.) **In meekness receive the engrafted** (better, *implanted*) **word.** 'Meekness' is a spirit, gentle and kindly under provocation. It is, specially, Christian love and forbearance in reference to others. (1 Peter 3: 15.) Those whom James addressed were not to hear the word that it might be used as a weapon of maliciousness, nor were they to indulge toward its unsparing teachers an angry stubbornness or impetuous opposition, which would effectually "bar the ear, the mind, the heart, the life against the truth." On the contrary, the word was to be received and taken to heart (Matt. 13: 23), working deliverance from sin inwardly. The expression is paradoxical. They had already received the word; they were to receive it again and again that their spiritual life might flourish. The word is the gospel, which is compared to seed. (1 Peter 1: 23; Luke 8: 4.) **Which is able to save your souls.** Here is the ground of the exhortation. Heed and honor the word as the agency which God employs to save you. The gospel is "the power of God unto salvation unto every one that believeth." (Rom. 1: 16; John 6: 63, 68.) It conveys transcendent blessings to the *soul*. As those, therefore, who would enjoy the present supports and graces that it conveys, and the future blessedness that it pledges, you are required to submit your natures to its transforming influence. To give up our sins by a genuine repentance and to embrace the gospel with faith and docility is the only method by which the immortal soul can be saved; then the word becomes for us and in us "mighty through God."

2. *The word must be heeded as the rule of life.* Ver. 22–25.

22. That the word must be received as the rule of life is now shown in the paragraph. (Ver. 22-25.) Hence it must be not only obeyed (ver. 22-24), but pondered and persisted in. (Ver. 25.) **But be ye doers of the word.** 'But' connects this verse with the previous one, and guards the reader against the supposition that a mere recognition of the truth of the gospel suffices for salvation. It is not necessarily implied that those to whom the injunction was addressed had not obeyed at all. Johnstone: "The believer should always be becoming in larger measure what he is already in some measure, wise, holy, and happy." The doers of the word are the observers of the gospel, those who recognize it as prescribing a line of conduct, and who obey its prescriptions as their law. (Ver. 25.) "Truth is for life." **And not hearers only, deceiving your own selves.** The passage is an allusion to the "Sermon on the Mount." (Matt. 7: 24.) The same thought occurs in Rom. 2: 13. The use of this word 'hearers,' instead of 'readers,' refers us to an age when the gospel was known for the most part only through the communications of the living teacher. Those who satisfy themselves merely with an ineffective knowledge of the word, cheat or defraud themselves. The term rendered 'deceiving' meant originally, *drawing false conclusions*, but it came to suggest the idea of loss as well as of delusion. Compare the Septuagint, Gen. 31: 7, 41. God's people are not actors, to whom a solemn but empty role of profession has been assigned, but

23 For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer,
he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a
glass:
24 For he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and
straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was.
25 But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty,

any one is a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he
is like unto a man beholding his [1] natural face in a
24 mirror: for he beholdeth himself, and goeth away,
and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he
25 was. But he that looketh into the perfect law, the

1 Gr. *the face of his birth.*

factors sent out to traffic for him with heavenly graces and temporal things. (Adams, on 2 Peter p. 666.)

23. For. The statement made in verse 22 is now confirmed by a comparison. The mere hearer of the word is likened to one who idly beholds his image in a *mirror*. The mirrors used by the ancients were of polished metal. (Exod. 38: 8; Job 37: 18.) Usually the imperfect image they gave was employed to indicate our scanty knowledge of divine things, which we see as by means of a mirror "darkly," as in 1 Cor. 13: 12, although glass may be here meant, or talc. But here the fact that the mirror does give an image, otherwise unseen, is made to illustrate the principle under consideration. It exhibits to the beholder his natural face, literally, *the face of his birth*, the face he was born with. This is distinguished from the real man—the moral physiognomy—the true portrait of the soul. The word of God can alone exhibit the man as he is, and reveal to him the disorders and defilements of unregenerate nature. (1 Cor. 14: 24, 25.) And he who hears the word and is not a doer, simply *looks into* the mirror. That the observation is careless and hasty, although not indicated by the words, is implied in the figure and in the language of the next verse.

24. For introduces the explanation of the figure, which is given in the narrative form—"for he beheld himself and has gone away, and straightway he forgot what manner of man he was (in the mirror)." A common experience is represented (so also in ver. 11) as a single past event. The mere hearing of the word does not benefit the man any more than did his transient look into the mirror. (Matt. 7: 24, seq.) The haste and carelessness with which he has turned to other matters is indicated, not only by **straightway,** but by the repetition of the conjunctions. The result is forgetfulness. (2 Peter 1: 9.) The reflection of the mirror does not remove the stains and disorders it discloses; the revelations of the word are of no advantage unless they induce a spiritual change. They show to a man his moral condition, his want of conformity to the requirements of God, and being forgotten they leave him unreformed and unblest.

NOTE—Our translators decided wisely when they declined to transfer the Greek idiom in this passage into our language; indeed we cannot but admire their judgment in the translation of the aorist in almost every instance where it occurs in our Epistle. In twelve instances, where it has reference to historical events (2: 21-25; 5: 17, 18), they render it as the exact equivalent, of the historical perfect of the Latins. Thirteen times they render it by our perfect tense, with the auxiliary "have"; here the reference is to events occurring in indefinite past time. Usually the habitual actions of the parties addressed, or else the dealings of God with his people. (2: 5, 6; 5: 3, 5, 11.) There is but one exception (5: 10), where the historical event should have been given in the narrative form, "the prophets who spoke." In nine instances the aorist has been translated by the present, the reference being made, with one exception, to general facts; the assertions are valid for all times, and therefore also for the present. Compare the fading flower (1: 11), the observer at the mirror (1: 24), the social customs. (2: 4, etc.) The text 4: 5 is exceptional; here the perfect would have been more appropriate. Prof. Dill, of Howard College, has carefully grouped and illustrated these passages; but his essay upon the subject is too elaborate for reproduction here.

25. Here the figure is retained; but, in contrast with the negectful hearer, who receives no benefit from the word, the hearer to whom it imparts a blessing is described. The one looks, the other gazes; the one continues, the other goes away; the one forgets, the other observes and does. The beginning of this verse adopts the narrative form of ver. 24.

Whoso looketh into gives a stronger idea than beholding; it implies that the beholder bends towards the object he regards with

and continueth *therein*, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed.

26 If any man among you seem to be religious, and

law of liberty, and *so* continueth, being not a hearer that forgetteth, but a doer that worketh, this man 26 shall be blessed in his doing. If any man [1] thinketh himself to be religious, while he bridleth not his

1 Or, *seemeth to be.*

earnest scrutiny. Compare Coleridge "Aid to Refl." Aph. 23 n. Peter uses the same word to express the interest of angels in the work of redemption, and in allusion also to the Cherubim stooping over the mercy seat. (1 Peter 1: 12.) **The perfect law of liberty.** The gospel, as containing the rule of Christian life—the truth which as received into the heart makes the believer free (John 8: 32.) from the bondage of ceremonies (Acts 15: 10), and from the despotism of the passions. The inspired writer doubtless has in view the most debasing and miserable of servitudes. (Jahn's "Archæology" § 172.) "The code of ethics which had been proclaimed by Christ, and of which the Sermon on the Mount remains as the great pattern and example." (Plumptre.) This new law was 'perfect' because it was spiritual. And it was a 'law of liberty' because it transformed the nature, brought it under the influence of elevating and commanding motives, and thus produced an unconstrained and joyful obedience to God. (Rom. 8: 2.) The sense of spiritual liberty is a holy impulse to serve God. Even under the Old Dispensation, those who entered into the deeper spirit of the law experienced its sweetness. (Ps. 19: 8-11.) In every age—

> He is the freeman whom the truth makes free,
> And all are slaves beside.

And continueth therein. This does not express the idea of James. 'Therein' should be stricken out. The idea is that the beholder continues looking into the law, so as to comprehend it and be prepared to carry out its prescriptions. The hearer must attend to and utilize the discoveries of the law, as one lingers at the mirror and attentively scrutinizes its reflections, so that the person may be improved and adorned. **He being not a forgetful hearer.** 'A forgetful hearer,' is, literally, *hearer of forgetfulness*, the genitive of the noun expressing quality, being used in the place of the adjective. Thus, in Luke 16: 8, "Steward of injustice" signifies "unjust steward." The same form of expression appears in chapter 2: 4, "judges of evil thoughts," for "evil-thinking judges." **But a doer of the work.** 'The' should be omitted. 'A doer of work' is an emphatic expression, indicating the necessary effect of the law upon one who attends to it; then it cannot but awaken the pious activity. **This man** is also emphatic; certainly he, and only he, will enjoy the liberty and probity which the law enjoins and confers. **Shall be blessed in his deed.** There is doubtless here a reference to the beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount, (Matt. 5: 3-11), which Jesus not only promised, but experienced. (John 4: 34.) The blessing connected with a life of pious conduct is real, and abiding; it goes out into a future that has no bounds. **In his deed** (or, *works*, the singular being used for the plural), not *by* it. Salvation by works is not implied, but the correspondence and inseparableness of obedience and salvation. [It would, I think, be more correct to translate the clause, "shall be blessed in his *doing*." The *doer* of Christian work finds a blessedness which he does not consciously seek, in *doing* this work. "It is more blessed to give than to receive." (Acts 20: 35.) In like manner every act of service to the Lord is in deepest harmony with the spiritual constitution of man, and brings into his soul true peace.—A. H.]

3. *The speech must be regulated by the word.* Ver. 26.

26. Having insisted upon the authority of the word as the rule of life, James proceeds to show that the speech must be regulated and guided by it. **If any man among you seem to be religious.** 'Among you' should be omitted. The meaning of *religious* can scarcely be expressed, except by a paraphrase. It relates not to the essence of religion, but to its external service; not to piety, but to worship (so in the Syriac)—a sense in which the adjective is still used in the unreformed countries of Europe. The member of a monastic order, whose life is largely devoted to acts of worship, is called a "religious." The text may be rendered: *If any one think himself to be a worshipper, not bridling his tongue, but deceiving his own heart, this man's worship is vain.* Johnstone

bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion *is* vain.
27 Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, *and* to keep himself unspotted from the world.

tongue but deceiveth his heart, this man's religion 27 is vain. Pure religion and undefiled before [1]our God and Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, *and* to keep himself unspotted from the world.

1 Or, *God and our Father.*

translates religious by "observants of religious service," and religion by "religious service" 'Seem,' *imagine himself*, implies that the opinion is false. (Matt. 6: 7; 1 Cor. 3: 18.) Among the Jews, religion largely consisted in external services; and it was natural that one who diligently devoted himself to their performance should regard himself as peculiarly acceptable to God. To this Paul referred (Acts 26: 5), where the same word is used for 'religion' as in this verse. **And bridleth not his tongue**—does not hold his tongue in check. An apt figure, which James repeats (3: 2, 3), and which is common in the Greek poets. The importance of the subject leads him to discuss it more at large (3: 1-12), and again in the conclusion of his Epistle. (5: 12-18.) But the immediate reference here is not to the number and enormity of the sins of the tongue, but to the presumed religious use of that member. James is rebuking those whose zeal exhausts itself in intemperate speech for what they regard as the truth and cause of God, and who suppose that this is true religious service. **But deceiveth his own heart.** The condemnation already implied in the previous clause is now asserted. The term is more general and stronger than that in ver. 22. A licentious and intemperate tongue cannot perform even a sincere service to God. The thought is brought out more distinctly in the characterization of such service—it is 'vain,' it is not only fruitless, but unsubstantial. Compare 1: 20. Like James, the Jewish philosopher, Philo, condemned those who practiced a *ritual religion* (same word as in our text) instead of holiness.

4. *The social intercourse must be regulated by the word.* 1: 27-2: 13.

a. In society, the gospel enjoins a ritual service of charity.

27. Now, to the unacceptable religious service of the unbridled tongue (ver. 26) is opposed **pure religion** (worship) **and undefiled before God.** 'Pure' and 'undefiled' have kindred meanings which it is not easy to distinguish. Yet, from their connection with the appositives, to visit the afflicted and to keep aloof from a polluting world, we agree with Bengel in referring the first to the inmost principle of religious service, self-forgetful and self-sacrificing love; and the second to our relations with the external world. The being whom we adore is a *Holy God.* He is the *Father* in whom the fatherless findeth mercy. (Ps. 68: 5.) And we serve him acceptably when we cultivate a spirit like his own. The general thought of the text has been finely expressed by Coleridge ("Aids to Ref. Aph.," 23): "The *outward service* of ancient religion, the rites, ceremonies, and ceremonial vestments of the old law, had morality for their substance. They were the letter, of which morality was the spirit; the enigma, of which morality was the meaning. But morality itself is the *service* and *ceremonial* of the Christian religion. The scheme of grace and truth that *became*, through Jesus Christ, the faith that looks down into the perfect law of liberty, has *light for its garment;* its very *robe is righteousness.*" **Is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction.** 'This,' preceding the (Greek) infinitives, gives emphasis. To exercise pitiful and helpful love to the needy is to render acceptable worship to God. 'To visit' (the species for the genus) is to seek out, in order to relieve, to care and provide for, as God visits his people. Luke 7: 19. Compare Matt. 25: 36, 43; Jer. 23: 2. 'Fatherless and widows' (by synecdoche of part for the whole), stand for all the afflicted and uncared for whom it may be in our power to relieve. These two classes are the types of earth's sufferers. (Job 29: 12.) The church to which James belonged specially cared for them. (Acts 9: 39.) Paul demanded, in his Epistle to Timothy, that widows should not be neglected. (1 Tim. 5: 3, 9.) **And to keep himself** (*one's self*) **unspotted from the world.** 'And,' preceding this second infinitive clause, is not in the original. Its omission makes the sentence more impressive. The course commended is, to guard one's self from the world, so as not

CHAPTER II.

MY brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, *the Lord* of glory, with respect of persons.

1 My brethren, [1]hold not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, *the Lord* of glory, with respect of per-

1 Or, *do ye, in accepting persons, hold the faith . . . glory?*

to be contaminated by it. Compare Matt. 16: 12. The world is not only "the mass of unrenewed humanity," which is separated from God, and is under the control of Satan (1 John 5: 19), and subject to secular interests and carnal passions, but whatever circumstances and objects inflame the lusts of nature. Believers must come in contact with the world; but, unlike the Pharisees, who sought to guard hand or skirt from what was ceremonially unclean, they were commanded to guard their minds and hearts from its contaminating influence. What need there was of vigilance (1 Tim. 5: 22) and prayer (John 17: 15) against this danger, Tholuck has shown in his essay on "The Nature and Moral Influence of Heathenism." Translated by Prof. Emerson in "Biblical Repository" 1832, Nos. V., VI., VII. A more terrible indictment was never written, nor a more fearful warning. A similar injunction to that in the last clause of our text was given by James in the letter sent by the Jerusalem Conference to the Gentile churches. (Acts 15: 20-29.) What was needed was not the external ablutions punctiliously observed by so many, but the internal purity of which those rites were the sign. Clemens ("Hom." xi. 28) says: "The essential thing in worship is to be pure."

---

b. In the Church the word is the principle of impartial and cordial fellowship. 2: 1-9.

1. In the last verse of the previous chapter, James states that the divine service of Christianity is charity. He now proceeds to consider the gospels as the principle of condescension and fraternity, a theme to which chapter 2: 1-9 is devoted. The theme is presented in the form of a warning against the odious social distinctions prevalent in the churches, distinctions based upon gifts of fortune only. **My brethren** appropriately and impressively introduces the admonition. Christ's disciples have an intimate and sacred bond of union in the common relationship they bear to the glorious Lord. **Have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons.** For 'have not' read *hold not.* The emphatic form of the text would be better represented by: "Let it not be with respects of persons that ye hold." 'Respects of persons' are favorable estimates of others, based, not upon what is praiseworthy in them, but upon external appearances and relations, as beauty, power, and splendor of dress, wealth, etc. (Gal. 2: 6; Rom. 2: 11.) James uses the plural to condemn all the forms and instances in which this vice finds expression. Christianity permits no depreciation of the lowly, wretched, and poor; hence, true faith cannot be held in connection with unrighteous disdain for those who enjoy no external advantages. 'The faith of our Lord' (objective genitive) signifies the faith in our Lord. Such faith not only confers on its possessor, but also recognizes in other men, a glory far transcending all worldly honor. Hence, he who despises a human being because he is poor, or, in particular contemns a friend of Jesus because he is clothed in an humble and soiled garb, cannot be a true disciple of so great a Lord. He was no respecter of persons (Matt. 22: 16); but, on the contrary, even preferred the poor. 'The Lord of glory' (genitive of quality): 'the Lord,' which is not in the original, is repeated in our version to suit the structure of the sentence in English; better, *our glorious Lord.* He issued from and he returned to the eternal glory (John 17: 5), and he bestows glory upon his disciples. (Rom. 8: 18.) Before him wealth and rank are trifles, in comparison with character, and Christians also should so regard them. The Syriac makes the genitive qualify faith, "the faith of glory," or "the glorious faith."

2-4. In these verses is given an example of the unchristian partiality which called for the admonition in ver. 1, and an indication of the source of this conduct. The verbs used in the Greek (aorists in this and the subsequent verses, especially in ver. 4, where the aorist indicative is used) show that the incidents are regarded as having already taken place. A literal rendering into English would be awkward. Johnstone: "See what you

2 For if there come unto your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment;
3 And ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place; and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool:

2 sons. For if there come into your [1]synagogue a man with a gold ring, in fine clothing, and there
3 come in also a poor man in vile clothing; and ye have regard to him that weareth the fine clothing, and say, Sit thou here in a good place; and ye say

1 Or, *assembly*.

have done, and consider the state of the heart thus revealed." **For** assigns the reason for the admonition: a sinful partiality had been shown in an obsequiousness to the rich and distinguished and a heartless depreciation of the poor. **Unto your assembly**—literally, *into your synagogue*, the place where a Christian church assembled for divine worship. This would be the synagogue, if the community had become Christian. (Vitringa, "De Syn. Vet.," I., 3, 2.) In any event, the Jewish Christians would give the familiar name to the place where they resorted to worship (Epiph. "Hæres," 30; Stanley, "Jewish Ch.," III., 517; Lightfoot, "On Phil." 150), and they would be apt to adopt the same internal arrangements. That the synagogue indicates the place, rather than the assembly, seems clear from the reference to seats in the next verse. Some of the seats were accounted more honorable than others. (Ver. 3.) The synagogues were accessible to all; so were the Christian assemblies. (1 Cor. 14: 25.) Burder improperly represents the assembly as a court of judicature.

[Yet is it not better to understand the words, "your synagogue," in this place as meaning "your assembly," referring to the people who met for worship, rather than to the place where they met? See Thayer, "Lexicon of the N. T.," s. v. συναγωγή, 2. a.; also Cremer, "Theol. Lex.," s. v., and compare Luke 12: 11; Acts 9: 12; 13: 43; 26: 11; and 2 Thess. 2: 1; Heb. 10: 25. Punchard says: "This is the only place in the New Testament where the Jewish word is used for a Christian congregation." "N. Test. Commentary," etc., Ed. by C. J. Ellicott, on this verse. But the compound word ἐπισυναγωγή in Heb. 10: 25 is perhaps best understood in the same way: "Not forsaking our own assembly."—A. H.]

A man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel. Literally, *a man gold-ringed, in shining apparel*. In that age rings were a more marked evidence of wealth and rank than they are now. They once distinguished senators and knights, but were now in more general use. The rich men of the empire, some of them, wore a ring on every joint, or even had six rings to a finger. Gorgeous clothing was also in great request, striking effects in dress, which among us have been toned down by Protestant Christianity,—"combinations of gold embroidery with Tyrian purple and crimson," and the like. The robe thrown in mockery upon our Lord was of this sort. (Luke 23: 11.) **A poor man in vile raiment.** A dress soiled and begrimed, such as the laborer is wont to wear—the opposite of the elegant and brilliant robes of the rich. The term here is the same as that in the Septuagint of Zech. 3: 3, 4, where the high priest is represented as clothed in squalid garments, instead of the splendid dress appropriate to his office. The specific idea is uncleanliness. Compare 1: 21; Rev. 22: 11. There is no occasion for discussing the question whether the persons referred to here were members of the Church or Christian guests coming in from abroad, or casual, unconverted attendants upon the public service. James is not drawing any sharp distinction between such persons and the Church; but is denouncing a partiality based only upon externals, and expressing itself in a place of Christian worship. The men referred to might be either Christians (ver. 5) or persons seeking instruction in Christian doctrine, or drawn to the synagogue merely by curiosity. In any case, they all were entitled to courtesy—nothing more and nothing less.

3. And ye have respect unto him—literally, *look upon* him, implying favorable regard, as in Luke 1: 48; 9: 38; in this case with reverence and admiration. The splendid dress attracts the eye; the character of the man himself is wholly overlooked. The words describing the rich man's attire are the same as in ver. 2. **Sit thou here in a good place**—literally, *pleasantly*. The idea of convenience is prominent; but that of honor is not excluded. This is also implied in the

4 Are ye not then partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts?
5 Hearken, my beloved brethren. Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?

to the poor man, Stand thou there, or sit under my
4 footstool; [1]are ye not divided [2]in your own mind,
5 and become judges with evil thoughts? Hearken, my beloved brethren; did not God choose them that are poor as to the world *to be* rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he promised to them

1 Or, *do ye not make distinctions*.....2 Or, *among yourselves*.

contrasts, 'sit' and 'stand,' 'here' and 'there,' 'in a good place' and 'under my footstool.' In the synagogues that part of the structure which pointed toward Jerusalem and where there was a chapel, with four columns, which contained the sacred parchments, was esteemed the most honorable place. The uppermost seats were those nearest the chapel. (Matt. 23: 6.) In the churches, the seats of honor would be those occupied by the elders of the church, and near to the Eucharistic table. These would also be most convenient to those who wished to enjoy or conduct the service. It is implied that those persons, whether deacons or other ushers, who took charge of this matter, acted by the authority and according to the will of the church. **Say unto him.** 'Unto him' should be omitted. **And say to the poor, stand thou there or sit** (here) **under my footstool.** The address shows utter indifference either to the comfort or the sensibility of the poor man. 'Either go yonder, where you can see and hear only by standing; or if you would come nearer, then sit on the floor.' Others had not only comfortable seats, but also *stools* to rest the feet upon. [The word 'here' after "sit" did not probably belong to the original text. It is omitted by Lach., Tisch., and Tregelles, after A B C.—A. H.]

4. Are ye not then partial in yourselves? Omit 'then.' This is not the point which the writer needs to urge. The partiality of feeling is proved already by the partiality in conduct. The verb retains the same signification as in 1: 6, and constantly elsewhere in the New Testament. Do you not *doubt* within yourselves? Do you not doubt your own faith and the honor it confers, when you make such distinctions? Do you not tamper with, and discredit the faith (ver. 1), which proclaims external splendor and riches as worthless in religion, while you yourselves magnify them by your servility? The question in the original is in the past tense, as relating to something which had already occurred. **And are become judges of evil thoughts?** (Genitive of quality.) Evil-thinking judges, who are swayed by the perverse opinions which distinguish the votaries of the world from the followers of Christ. Whenever such distinctions prevail in a church, the mere creed has no validity. At *heart* its members prefer the transitory to the enduring, and their conduct is in conflict with their consciences and their religion. Plumptre: "In acting as they did, men made themselves judges between rich and poor and with 'base reasonings'; or, better, perhaps, what we call 'base calculations' gave a preference to the former. These evil thoughts are the cause of their partial and odious decisions."

5. James proceeds to show how perverse and unchristian was the conduct he reproved. On the one hand, to depreciate the poor was to contravene God's loving purposes toward them. (Ver. 5.) On the other hand, to flatter the rich, as such, was to encourage the arrogant spirit which was now raging against Christians (ver. 6), and the dread Lord whose name they bore. (Ver. 7.) First comes the urgent call **Hearken** (attend to this), my **beloved brethren.** (1: 16, 17.) The argument here as in the succeeding verses is put in the spirited form of a question.

Hath not God chosen the poor of this world. Better rendered, *Did not God choose the poor as to this world?* Compare 1 Cor. 1: 27. God did not choose all the poor, but the poor in preference to the rich. The church at Jerusalem was poor, and so in general were the early Christians. Our text indeed refers to those who are poor in the estimation of the world, but only those who are destitute of worldly substance are so esteemed. God's preferences create a presumption in favor of the poor, which Christians should recognize in estimating the relations and adjusting the civilities of life. It is not permitted us to contemn that class from which the heavenly King is wont to select his heralds and his heirs. (Luke 6: 20; Matt. 5: 3.) **Rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom.**

6 But ye have despised the poor. Do not rich men
oppress you, and draw you before the judgment seats?
7 Do not they blaspheme that worthy name by the
which ye are called?

6 that love him? But ye have dishonoured the poor
man. Do not the rich oppress you, and themselves
7 drag you before the judgment-seats? Do not they
blaspheme the honourable name [1] by the which ye
8 are called? Howbeit if ye fulfil the royal law, ac-

1 Gr. *which was called upon you.*

Insert *to be* before 'rich.' The faith is not the wealth itself; but the sphere in which the wealth is enjoyed. Believers are rich through faith; by this principle they are related to an invisible world, and enjoy the blessings of the Spirit, righteousness, and peace, and joy. **Heirs of the kingdom.** In addition to incomparable blessings now, believers have glorious prospects. However poor as to the world, they are "if children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away." Rom. 8: 17; 1 Peter 1: 4. (Storr's "Diss. on Kingdom of Christ," § 8.) **Which he hath promised to them that love him.** To faith is given the riches of grace: to love the dignities of heaven. The divine kingdom, as promised to these trustful hearts, is that future and perfect order of things which will ensue when Christ solemnly returns from heaven; when the dead will be restored to life; when all the sorrows that oppress the present life will be removed, and all the powers hostile to God will be subdued. (Matt. 6: 10; 26: 29; Luke 13: 38; 2 Peter 1: 11.) (Grimm.) The allusion is to such assurances of our Lord as are recorded in Luke 6: 20; 12: 31, 32, "Blessed are ye poor for yours is the kingdom of God." "Fear not little flock; it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." The poor to whom these promises are given are those who are endowed with faith and love, kindred sentiments, of which the second is the beautiful undergrowth of the first. External poverty is indeed not in itself a blessing; it becomes so "in as far only as the want of earthly treasures and earthly comforts leads us to seek a more enduring treasure and a more abiding consolation." (Forbes "Scrip. Parallelism," p. 169.)

6. But ye—in contrast with God, who honors the poor, and chooses them as the heirs of his kingdom. **Have despised the poor**—better, *but ye disgraced the poor.* The verb (in the aorist) refers to the case indicated in ver. 2, 3. Those whom James addressed had not only despised the poor in their hearts, but had expressed their contempt by discriminating against them. 'The poor' (a masculine adjective-noun in the singular, with the article) stands for the whole class; Winer; Syriac, "the poor man." **Do not rich men oppress you?** Plumptre: "Lord it over you." Another argument against obsequiousness to the rich is derived from their notorious oppressions. In Judea the wealthy were, for the most part, Sadducees (Jos. "Ant.," 13, 10, 6), who, although they had little faith to contend for, were yet foremost in their persecutions of the early Christians. "The aristocracy of the priesthood" belonged to this sect. Compare Acts 4: 1, 6; 5: 17. Violence in enforcing the payment of debts is not here referred to, but the persecutions which were dictated by the love of rule and the pride of station. **And draw you before the judgment seats**—better, *and do not they drag you* (the same verb occurs Acts 21: 30) *into courts of justice.* The rich used violence towards the Christian poor, even in bringing them before the magistrates and invoking against them the authority of law. It was from that class that persecutions chiefly came; hence, those who belonged to it were entitled to no special consideration in the house of God. *They*, omitted in our version, is emphatic: Is it not they who drag you? So in the next verse.

7. Do not they blaspheme that worthy name?—*Is it not they that blaspheme the worthy name?* The rich do not only persecute the poor believers; they also revile the sacred name of Christ (1 Peter 4: 16), after whom the disciples were called. (Acts 11: 26.) First, doubtless, they were called Christ's people, then Christians, just as we were first called baptized people, then Baptists. ("Broadmead Records," pp. 15, 18.) **By the which ye are called?**—literally, *which was named upon you*, a Hebraism indicating that they belonged to him whose name they bore. Thus Israel bore God's name, in sign of allegiance to him. (Deut. 28: 10.) The Jewish persecutors denounced the claim of our Lord to be the Messiah whom the prophets had her-

8 If ye fulfil the royal law according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well:
9 But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.

cording to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neigh-
9 bour as thyself, ye do well: but if ye have respect of persons, ye commit sin, being convicted by the
10 law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the

alded, and they strove to constrain the disciples by threats and violence to imitate their example. (Acts 26: 11.) The name which inflamed the hostility of the Sadducean priests was a 'worthy name,' honored by all believers, and deserving honor from all men. It was the very hope and glory of Israel that was outraged by the maledictions of the powerful, and in the persons of Christ's persecuted people. Hence, in their partiality to the rich, the disciples not only acted foolishly, but made themselves guilty of infringement upon that reverence which they owed to the name of Christ. (Huther.) Stanley claims that all the early baptisms were in the name of the Lord Jesus, which implies the Trinity: the fuller formula came into use at a later period. Neander also holds that the name here referred to was not Christ, but Jesus. ("Planting and Training of the Church," p. 334.)

8. If ye fulfil the royal law, according to the Scripture—*yet if ye fulfil, or if indeed ye fulfil.* For James has in view a possible objection, that in depreciating the wealthy he was violating the law of love, which embraces them as well as the poor. In reply James commends the law, and magnifies it as a 'royal law,' an eminent command, having a royal supremacy over all others. (Rom. 13: 8-10; Gal. 5: 14.) The Syriac translator regarded the law as royal, because coming from the Heavenly King. (1 John 4: 21.) It is a sacred duty, enjoined under the Old Dispensation (Lev. 19: 18) and re-affirmed by our Lord (Matt. 22: 39), as the principle of all right conduct in human society. Compare Rom. 13: 9, 10; and, as the spirit of the divine kingdom, Mark 12: 34. 'Law' here signifies a single command. 'According to the Scripture' is merely "a form of citation." (Meyer.) Under the gospel this law is termed 'new,' from its prominence, its higher motive, its divine example, and its broader influence. (Farrar's "Life of Christ," 2: 295.) **Ye do well.** The words have a certain tone of ironical concession. The Jews accepted the law as a summary of the whole body of moral legislation in reference to the relations of man with man. They did not dispute that it was of the greatest consequence and utility; that it was excellent and worthy of God, and that it had every claim to consideration from all men. Whether, however, they fulfilled it or not was questionable; and whether they had this or something else in view, in their flattering attentions to the rich, was also worthy of consideration. The language suggests something stronger than doubt in the writer's mind. **Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.** This command is not only repeated by Christianity, but transfigured in it. Here love to others becomes the love of service and the spirit of sacrifice. "A new commandment I give unto you that ye love one another, *as I have loved you.*" (John 13: 34, 35.) Without love we are nothing. (1 Cor. 13: 1-3.) James indeed contents himself with repeating the law in the form in which it had been accepted by the Jewish people; but the influence of this command, as repeated in the gospel and commended by the example of its Author, has been unprecedented; it has changed the whole aspect of domestic and social life. The compassionate love which makes so many sacrifices and establishes so many institutions for the relief of the wants and woes of men was a virtue unknown to antiquity. See the fine sketch of Christian benevolence given by Uhlhorn. ("Conflict of Christianity," p. 191-205.)

9. An answer to the pretext of the objector in ver. 8. **But if ye have respect to persons**—literally, *if ye respect persons*—**ye commit sin.** Compare Matt. 7: 23; Acts 10: 35. The partiality you display, instead of honoring the law, breaks it. The very code to which you appeal designates you as the guilty transgressors of its requirements. The language is emphatic—*it is sin that ye commit.* **And are convinced** (*being convicted*) **of the law as transgressors.** Some think that the law here referred to is that in Lev. 19: 15, or Deut. 16: 19, which indeed has respect to judgments, but may be extended to include marks of honor in the public assembly. Others adduce the very law of love (ver. 8) as violated by respects of persons; all are not loved when some are depreciated. The latter reference is

10 For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one *point*, he is guilty of all.
11 For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law.

whole law, and yet stumble in one *point*, he is be-
11 come guilty of all. For he who said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou dost not commit adultery, but killest, thou art be-
12 come a transgressor of the law. So speak ye, and

to be preferred. Those who respected persons violated the law as a whole, the law in its spirit. Yet the violation of a single precept would involve the transgressor in the guilt of rebellion against the heavenly Lawgiver. (Ver. 10.)

c. The gospel sanctions all the prescriptions of the Second Table of the Decalogue; those relating to our relative duties. Ver. 10, 11.

10. For occurs both in ver. 10, 11, which present the proof that partial discriminations are criminal. James lays down the principle that he who violates one of the commandments breaks all. A law proceeding from God, and claiming the heart of the creature, cannot be honored, unless it be wholly and sacredly observed. The same ethical paradox is found in the Rabbinical writings. Rabbi Johanan says: "He who does all things save one is guilty of all the rest." **Whosoever shall keep** (*hath kept*) **the whole law.** The moral law is primarily referred to; yet the principle would also embrace the Christian law, which the converted Jews acknowledge. **And yet offend** (*hath offended*) **in one point.** The sense is very well expressed by the noun, which is supplied in our version. Some, however, would prefer "commandment" instead of "point." **He is guilty of all** — better, *has become guilty;* he has sinned against all, and has become liable to a corresponding punishment. As in cases involving capital punishment one offence is fatal, so under the government of God the knowing and persistent violation of one precept suffices to condemn, making the observance of all other duties nugatory. When a servant of the Lord does only what he chooses, he follows, not the will of the Master, but his own. He has no reverence for the law, and no piety toward the Lawgiver; hence even his formal acts of obedience, arising from lower motives, are violations of the moral code. "It is probable enough," says Plumptre, "that the Pharisees, who misrepresented the teaching of James in the Church of Antioch, laid stress on these words as including circumcision and the ceremonial law, as well as the precepts which were moral and eternal." (Acts 15: 1, 5, 24.)

NOTE.—The principle of our text needed to be asserted among the Jews, who were possessed by "an insatiable spirit of casuistry," and who were fond of debating the relative value of the precepts of the law. Compare Matt. 22: 34-40. Some regarded the law as to fringes and phylacteries as of first importance; others the command requiring that the name of God should be honored; others the requirement of ablution. The disciples of Hillel regarded certain positive precepts as of no importance. A variety of curious illustrations has been collected by Farrar. ("Life of Christ," pp. 238-241.) On the contrary, the object of the law is to test the spirit of obedience, and that spirit questions nothing that is demanded.

11. The principle of the foregoing verses is established by the specification of laws which, however diverse in character, rested on the authority of the one supreme Lawgiver. **He that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill.** These two commandments (Exod. 20: 13, 14) are specified because they are the first belonging to the second table of the moral law. The fifth commandment belongs to the first table, duty to parents being regarded as religious service by the Jews (Jos. "Ant.," B. 6: 6; comp. 1 Tim. 5: 4), as well as by the Greeks and Romans. (Taylor Lewis: "Platonic Theology," 87-94.) In the New Testament, the prohibition of adultery always precedes that of murder [Except probably in Mark 10: 19. See Revised Version.—A. H.], showing that this was then the traditional order. **Now, if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law.** The conclusion refers back to ver. 9. In religion the law is the will of the Lawgiver; hence he who violates the law in one particular violates it wholly. Huther: "James, indeed, could have argued also from the inner connection of all the commandments, or from the fact that the transgression of one commandment betrayed a defect of character which made the fulfilling of the rest of the law impossible;

12 So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty.
13 For he shall have judgment without mercy, that hath shewed no mercy; and mercy rejoiceth against judgment.

so do, as men that are to be judged by a law of
13 liberty. For judgment *is* without mercy to him that hath shewed no mercy: mercy glorieth against judgment.

but since he did not, such observations must not be arbitrarily thrust into his words."

d. The duties we owe to men are sanctioned by the final judgment. Ver. 12, 13.

12. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty. The gospel claims for the moral law the solemn sanctions of the judgment. (Ver. 12, 13.) And the speech, as well as the conduct, must be subjected to this ordeal. (Matt. 12: 37.) The law is, as it were, the instrument through which the judgment passes. The imperatives here are in the present tense, indicating an action already begun, and to be continued; or, one that is permanent and frequently occurring. Hence this form is commonly employed in the measured and dispassionate language of laws and moral precepts. (Winer.) **The law of liberty.** A favorite phrase of James, compare 1: 25, indicating the preceptive will of God as the will of man, subdued by grace, cheerfully surrenders to it. Our Lord uses similar language. (John 8: 32.) So also does Paul (Rom. 8: 2, 15), though elsewhere he speaks of the law, when enforced upon the reluctant will, as gendering to bondage. (Gal. 4: 24.) To the renewed will the law is liberty, while at the same time it is the rule of life and the standard of judgment. And that grace in the heart which produces free-will obedience to God (1 Peter 2: 16) will awaken a pitying love toward the poor whom so many were wont to despise. (Ver 6)

13. This passage shows the importance of the tender humanity recommended (1: 27), and discloses the vital spirit of the law of liberty. **For he shall have judgment,** etc. —better, *The judgment will be without mercy to him that shewed no mercy.* The law of retribution here proclaimed is derived from our Lord's sermon (Matt. 7: 1, 2), "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you again." Compare also Matt. 5: 25, 26; 6: 12-15; 18: 21-35. Mercy is a species of love; it is benignity toward the unfortunate, with the desire and effort to help them. (Matt. 9: 13.) With this gracious principle the law is charged by the gospel; it flows from God to man, and from man to his fellows; and it will serve as a criterion of character in the day of final account. **And mercy rejoiceth agaiust judgment.** Omit 'and.' Instead of 'rejoiceth' read 'glorieth.' The believer, although a sinner, has in his own loving heart the assurance that the condemning sentence of the law will not be inflicted upon him; but rather expects the rewards of grace, being confident that God will not condemn the imitators of his goodness.

> Earthly power doth then show likest God's,
> When mercy seasons justice.

How many are the illustrations of this fine text! Our Lord's definition and commendation of mercy in the parable of the Good Samaritan; the necessity of forgiveness to acceptable prayer; the parable of the Unjust Debtor; the picture of the last judgment, with the merciful and the unmerciful divided from each other inexorably and forever! Mercy is the sign of the grace that makes the sinner safe, and thus it becomes the joyful consciousness of safety. Mercy and judgment are the great moral influences by which religion regulates the lives of men.

5. Warning against the error that speculative faith, which does not heed the preceptive part of the word, suffices for salvation. Ver. 14-26.

14. Saving faith is practical. This paragraph, extending to ver. 26, closes the first division of our Epistle. It is devoted to the refutation of the objection that faith by itself suffices for salvation. In the present verse James insists that saving faith must be practical. The writer has already indicated faith as the condition of salvation, in declaring that God begets men by the word of his truth (1: 18), and in enjoining them to receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save the soul. But now he attacks the prevalent opinion that faith without works can save. The Jews regarded faith, when existing alone, as saving, and in this sense interpreted the famous passage of Habakkuk. (2: 4.) They used, as a morning and evening passport to the throne of grace, the text:

14 What *doth it* profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him?
15 If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food,
16 And one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be *ye* warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them

14 What doth it profit, my brethren, if a man say he hath faith, but have not works? can that faith save
15 him? If a brother or sister be naked, and in lack
16 of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Go in peace, be ye warmed and filled; and yet ye give

"Hear O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord" (Deut. 6: 4); and with this proclamation of the Divine Unity, the dying gave their souls to God. To those who clung to the assurance that this sufficed for salvation, James addressed the argument of this passage. Compare 2: 19; Matt. 7: 21 seq. **What doth it profit my brethren**—literally, *What is the profit?* The assertion is stronger, as put into an interrogative form. **Though a man** (*any one*) **say he hath faith, and have not works.** No special emphasis should be laid upon the verb 'say,' as if the statement were a mere pretence. Yet neither should the sharpness of its meaning be disregarded. The persons in question, having no works to approve their faith, could profess it only by words. 'Faith' here does not occur in the Pauline sense of persuasion. The only faith which can exist in the case supposed is not a believing with the heart unto righteousness; it is not the reception of truth as the principle of a new life; it is a mere intellectual conviction, a speculative tenet, external to the affections and the conscience, and remote from the activities of life; a dead notion sepulchred in the brain. The works referred to are such as are the evidences of a living faith and the fulfillment of the law of liberty. **Can faith save him?** In the original the article precedes faith (*the* faith). Some suppose that the article here is equivalent to the demonstrative pronoun: can *that* faith (such a faith as that) save him. Others emphasize the pronoun him (such a a man as he is). We think that a stress should be laid upon both the article and the pronoun; but especially upon the article. The faith here spoken of is certainly not the principle which receives with meekness the engrafted word. The salvation is that which the man expects in the future. (1 Thess. 5: 8.) James has in view not so much any present privileges and assurances, but rather a full and final deliverance from evil, the fullness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ. The severance of faith and works, which was maintained commonly among the Jewish people, was exhibited in the spirited rebuke of Paul. (Rom. 2: 17-24.) Yet no inspired writer has more impressively insisted upon the necessary connection between faith and salvation. Compare John 3: 16.

b. Worthlessness of an inoperative faith—to the needy (ver. 15, 16); to the professor of religion. Ver. 17.

15. James now proceeds to adduce a case involving that most sacred obligation of Christians—the exercise of pitying love. (1: 27; 2: 13.) The case is that of a brother or sister in sore need. The case would indeed apply to all the descendants of the patriarchs, who formed one family; but it here directly applies to members of the Christian community, whose relationship was the more intimate, because it was spiritual and eternal. (Acts 10: 28; 11: 1; 1 Cor. 5: 11.) This circumstance made the example more impressive. **Be naked, and destitute of daily food.** The want of clothing, and of the nutriment to sustain life from day to day, indicates absolute destitution. Our Lord had already required, by the most solemn sanction, that such distresses should be relieved. (Matt. 25: 36-43.) That the Christians of Judea were many of them reduced to such extremities may be inferred from the collections made in their behalf by the Gentile churches (1 Cor. 16: 1; Rom. 15: 26), and from the earnest expostulation of 1 John 3: 17. It has been suggested that, probably at this time, the famine predicted by Agabus prevailed (Acts 11: 28-30), and that the Jewish converts, wrapped up in the pride of race and of orthodoxy, had resigned the care of their poor to the foreign Christians.

16. Depart in peace. An expression of kindly feeling, which would be an insult, if not accompanied by an act of charity and relief. It was then in familiar use. (Luke 7: 50; 8: 48; Acts 16: 36.) **Be ye warmed and filled**—get yourselves clad (Job 31: 20), and may you have food in abundance; or, more exactly, *warm yourselves, feed yourselves.* Sympathy is sweet, if one has nothing more to give to those who are starving and shivering; but

not those things which are needful to the body; what *doth it* profit?
17 Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone.
18 Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works.
19 Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble.

them not the things needful to the body; what doth it profit?
17 Even so faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself.
18 [1]Yea, a man will say, thou hast faith, and I have works: shew me thy faith apart from *thy* works, and I by my works will shew thee *my* faith.
19 Thou believest that [2]God is one; thou doest well:
20 the demons also believe, and shudder. But wilt

1 Or, *But some one will say*.....2 Some ancient authorities read *there is one God*.

sympathy alone, from one who can give relief, is a mockery, as the style of the appeal is made to indicate. Generous words are a poor substitute for food and clothing; yet how widely this kind of charity still prevails! **Notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful for the body**—those things necessary to its maintenance. **What doth it profit?** Either to those who are in want, or those who send them empty away, without a stick from the wood-pile, or a garment from the wardrobe, or a crust from the cupboard, to "warm and fill."

17. Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone—better, *So also faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself*. Here the illustration is applied—a barren assent to a dogma is as worthless as lip charity. This is also Paul's teaching in Rom. 2: 13: "Not the hearers of the law are just before God; but the doers of the law shall be justified." A Christian name without works of piety has as little substance and vitality in it as a Christian brotherhood without acts of charity. The works spoken of are not added to faith, but spring out of it, as shoots from a living germ. A faith without works is dead in itself; its very root is dead. It bears the same relation to the saving faith required by the gospel as a corpse does to a man. And as a lifeless body can do nothing, a faith without works can profit nothing—its unproductiveness suffices to show that it has no life or power.

c. Genuine faith must be connected with works, else there is no evidence of its existence (ver. 18), nor any strength and blessedness in the experience of professors (ver. 19). The principle confirmed by the example of Abraham (ver. 20–24); and Rahab. Ver. 25, 26.

18. Yea a man may say—rather, *but some one will say*. This objection may with certainty be anticipated (compare 1 Cor. 15: 35), from some one who judges between the two parties, James and his opponent, and who proposes to settle the disagreement by a compromise. The person here intervening neither represents the Gentile convert (Plumptre), nor the Jewish Christian whom James opposes (Huther), but some indifferent person, who regards both James and his opponents as one-sided, and who decides accordingly. A slight addition will make the meaning of the passage apparent: "but some one will say: that thou (James' opponent) hast faith and I (James) have works." The difference between you two is, that the one values the truth of Christianity, and the other its ethical system.

Shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works. The reply of James is, that without works faith cannot be proved to exist at all; for without works, it has no expression. You cannot show your faith, except by works of piety and philanthropy. On the contrary, the works I do, prove that I have faith, for without faith I could not do them. The difference between us is not merely controversial, but vital. This is expressed in a very spirited manner by James' challenge. "Vainly do we glory in the gospel, unless we are also in love with virtue." [Possibly the sense of this expression may be brought to light by a more literal translation of the best-supported text: "Show me thy faith without the works"—which real faith produces—"and I will show thee from my works the faith" which produces them.—A. H.]

19. Thou believest that there is one God—better, *that God is one*. This article of faith, common to Jews and Christians, and distinguishing revealed religion from the popular heathenism, is selected as representing an orthodox creed. **Thou doest well**—thou hast accepted the primary truth of religion. **The devils** (*demons*) **also believe** (*it*) **and tremble** (*shudder*). The demons, who are the angels and ministers of the devil (Matt. 9: 34; 12: 24), like their master, "abode not in the truth" (John 8: 44; 1 Tim. 4: 1), and were the pa-

20 But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?
21 Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?

thou know, O vain man, that faith apart from works
21 is barren? Was not Abraham our father justified by works, in that he offered up Isaac his son upon

trons of idolatry. (1 Cor. 10: 20.) Yet they have never lost their belief that there is one God, although this transcendent truth produces no change in their character, and sheds no gleam of hope upon the darkness of their future destiny. They hate the infinitely perfect One, and await with terror the coming of that day when he will cast them into the lake of fire. (Matt. 8: 29.)

The sarcasm is terrible. A faith which is merely a matter of knowledge does not save, it does not even recognize God to be what he is, our highest good; it does not change the character; it does not give assurance of future salvation and blessedness, and through that assurance find present peace; it is the faith of demons, who, at the thought, shudder like Eliphaz (Job 4: 15.), when the condemning spirit passed before him. Monotheism chastises where it does not chasten the transgressor. "In his crimes, it is not the heavy irons of his prison, but the deep eye of his Judge, from which he shrinks; and in his repentance he weeps, not upon the lap of Nature, but at the feet of God." ("Westminster Review," 1852, p. 183.)

20. James now proceeds to prove the necessity of uniting works with faith, from the example of Abraham, the father of believers. (Ver. 20-24.) **Wilt thou know?** by proofs from scriptural examples, whose authority you acknowledge. The question expresses the assurance of triumph. **O vain man.** 'O' occurs in the New Testament only in addresses of adjuration and censure. (Matt. 17: 17; Luke 24: 25; Rom. 9: 20.) 'Vain,' corresponding to "Raca" in Matt. 5: 22, is the same as empty, indicating, not intellectual, but moral defect. The epithet, forbidden to revenge, is permitted in fraternal and official correction. (Matt. 23: 17, 19; Luke 24: 25; Gal. 3: 1, 3.) The possessor of the faith here referred to had no real worth, no spiritual riches. **That faith without works is dead.** Compare 2 Peter 1: 8. The last word varies in the manuscripts. In some the word is "*dead*," in others it is "*idle*"; in either case the meaning would be substantially the same: that which has no life, profits no one, and effects nothing. It is like capital which lies idle, and brings no interest—dead capital. Only from love, and in work, does faith truly live. [Here too the article before 'works,' in the Greek text, may well be noticed: "that faith without the works"—that is, its works, or the works which it naturally produces, 'is idle.'—A. H.]

21. Was not Abraham our father? The example of Abraham was of high authority among the Jews, because he was their most illustrious progenitor, and enjoyed the special favor of God. Accordingly, James appeals to his case, to show that works must accompany faith as its fruits, and that without works a profession of faith is valueless. **Justified by works.** This statement seems to be contradictory to what James says in ver. 23, where Abraham's 'faith' is declared to have been imputed to him for righteousness, and also to Paul's argument upon the same text and example. (Rom. 3: 28, *seq.*) The prominence which one of these writers assigns to works and the other to faith, although they both were dealing with the same case, is to be explained by the different ends they had in view. Both of them taught that saving faith is operative (Gal. 5: 6; James 2: 18.); but Paul, arguing against formalists, who taught that meritorious works are the condition of salvation, insisted upon the necessity of faith; while James, arguing against Antinomians, who claimed that the profession of an orthodox faith suffices, insisted upon the necessity of a life of practical godliness. How deeply rooted was this Antinomianism among the Jews appears from the rabbinical discussion of the subject. Compare Lightfoot, "Comm. on Galatians," Note on "Faith of Abraham." The genius of interpreters and theologians has diligently addressed itself to the task of harmonizing these two writers; yet the difficulty is not less great in reconciling the statements, which *James himself* makes in the present paragraph, for he too declares that Abraham's faith was accounted to him for righteousness, while yet he maintains that the patriarch was justified by works, and that the latter justification was in some way the fulfillment of the former imputation of right-

22 Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?
23 And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abra-

22 the altar? [1] Thou seest that faith wrought with his
23 works, and by works was faith made perfect; and the scripture was fulfilled which saith, And Abra-

1 Or, *Seest thou . . . perfect.*

eousness which had occurred many years before. In the first case, Abraham believed God, and was accepted as righteous; in the second, he obeyed God and was approved as righteous. It is this last condition, in which operative faith receives the divine approval, to which James applies the term justification. The ancient believer was proved to be righteous by his conduct, and the divine declaration that he was righteous was thus established as true. This meaning of the verb, to *justify*, to declare or prove to be what one should be, or professes to be, appears in various passages of Scripture, as in Matt. 11: 19, "Wisdom is justified of her children"—is proved by their conduct to be true and divine. We learn in 1 Tim. 3: 16 that Christ was "justified in the Spirit," proved by his deeds and teachings to possess a divine nature. So Rom. 4: 3, Abraham had a faith which God accepted as righteousness; that he had a faith of this character was proved by the sacrifice of Isaac. **When he had offered his son Isaac upon the altar.** That the son was actually laid upon the altar showed that he was a victim devoted to certain death. (Gen. 22: 9.) Among the various "works" which sprung from Abraham's faith, this is specified, because it was the most conspicuous of them, and because it was specially honored and rewarded. (Gen. 22: 15-18.) How it pleased God appears from his renewal of the promise on this account to Isaac, and through him to his posterity, whom James was now addressing. (Gen. 26: 2-5.) The promise had already been given to Abraham as a believer (Gen. 12: 2, 3), but now it was solemnly renewed as a reward of his act of faith. The honor in which this act was held among the Jews appears from the eulogy of Jesus Sirach, 44: 20. The greatness of the sacrifice is also intimated here, in the addition, *his son.* On that wonderful occasion Abraham was justified by his work.

22. Instead of **seest thou how,** etc.—*thou seest that*—**faith wrought with his works.** Such is the conclusion to be drawn from the example of Abraham. The faith he had, instead of being a mere intellectual tenet, was an active principle, operating continuously in the production of good works. His godly life had its root and support in faith. The two, faith and works, went together, the spiritual life within expressing itself in outward conformity with the revealed will of God. The Syriac Version reads: "Seest thou that his faith aided his works?" **And by works was faith made perfect.** This signifies something more than that the works verified or confirmed the faith: they displayed its perfection; in them faith revealed its excellence and glory. The verb occurs in a similar sense in 2 Cor. 12: 9. "My strength is made perfect in weakness;" then it is exerted and is demonstrated in its genuineness and power. It is true, no doubt, as Huther observes, that faith in producing works becomes ever more fully what according to its nature and design it should be, and that, as the power of love increases and perfects itself through the practice of the works of love, so also faith grows and perfects itself through the performance of its appropriate works. But it may be questioned whether such an idea is even suggested by the previous verse, of which the present is simply the conclusion. What is implied there, however, that the faith existed prior to the works, is more distinctly intimated here.

23. And the scripture was fulfilled. 'The Scripture' signifies the passage or saying which is immediately quoted. The language, which is such as usually indicates the accomplishment of a prediction, cannot be taken literally; for the text quoted (Gen. 15: 6) was not a prophecy, but only a statement that Abraham had faith and was accepted by God as righteous. But neither the profession of the patriarch nor the approving sentence of God would have been justified, had not Abraham given an external manifestation to the vital principle and the high character with which he had been credited. Both of them were invisible, until they found expression in the practices of a pious life. The text was a prophecy, only as it promised a career of excellence; and in the works of Abraham the happy augury was fulfilled. The result of the trial showed why God assigned such

ham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God.
24 Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.
25 Likewise also was not Rahab the harlot justified

ham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness; and he was called the friend of
24 God. Ye see that by works a man is justified, and
25 not only by faith. And in like manner was not also Rahab the harlot justified by works, in that she

value to Abraham's faith; its heroical and supernatural energy therein appeared. **Abraham believed God and it was imputed unto him for righteousness.** God graciously accepted and rewarded the patriarch's trust in him as righteousness. (Rom. 4: 3-5.) This is the Pauline idea of justification; James accepts the doctrine, but his phraseology is different in part and is less precise. (Ver. 24.) **And he was called the friend of God.** So certain and so high was the righteousness Abraham possessed, that he was also designated by the distinguished title of the friend of God. This title appears twice in our Version: in 2 Chron. 20: 7, where "thy friend" is literally "thy beloved," and in Isa. 41: 8. It was commonly applied to Abraham among the Jews, and appears in Philo. It is a common title of Abraham among the Arabs of the present day, who designate Hebron the city of Abraham by the name El Khalil, the Friend. That Abraham was a righteous man eminently was acknowledged by every one. We attain the same honor by imitating the example set by the Father of the Faithful. Jesus says "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." (John 15: 14.)

NOTE.—Dr. J. G. Rosenmueller adduces this passage as one of the proofs to show that the fulfillments of prophecy may take place in something which only resembles the literal and historical sense; but incorrectly. For, as in strictness there was no real prophecy in the divine acceptance of believing Abraham as righteous, the subsequent evidence that he was righteous cannot be regarded either as a real or as an accommodated fulfillment. The conduct of Abraham proved him to have such a character as the word of God has ascribed to him. The facts of the case *verified* the estimates of inspiration, and confirmed the oracle of divine approval. The verb 'fulfilled' does not change its meaning here, but is used metaphorically.

24. Then how should be omitted. **Ye see that by works a man is justified**—declared to be a righteous man. No doctrine of religion accepted, no profession of religion made, can prove this. The performance of life's duties in the fear of God proclaims the genuineness of the disciple's professions and his possession of divine grace. **And not by faith only**—(Syriac) "faith alone." This indicates that faith justifies; yet to that state of justification which James is considering, and which embraces the beginning and the whole progress of the Christian experience, works are as necessary as faith. There must be faith, such as Abraham cherished, to establish the relation of intimacy with God; but, as time and opportunity summon the believer, there must be good works also, in order to approve his righteousness; and to him, as he was to Abraham, God is the friend and patron. 'Faith only' signifies faith by itself, having no influence or forth-putting. Neither does Paul command this sort of faith; but rather a faith that works by love and produces purity. Both Paul and James recognize faith as a principle, without which acceptable works cannot be performed and salvation cannot be attained. But the teaching of Paul upon the subject is deeper, and yet more sharply defined; and to this extent confirms the view of those who regard his epistle as later than that of James, who gives the practical view. The principle here stated by our author is the rule of the final judgment.

NOTE—Neander and others hold that the fanatical faith which James was denouncing was rather a perversion of Judaism than of Christianity, being identical with that described in Matt. 23: 15. Stanley indicates its two forms. 1. A blind reliance upon the privileges of the chosen race, like the Mohammedan belief that a death in battle is a passport to heaven. Compare Jer. 7: 4; 2 Macc. 12: 43-45; Eccles. 7: 4. Also James 1: 13; Jos. "Ant." 13: 5, 9. This presumptuous confidence was displayed in the last siege of Jerusalem. 2. A trust in their orthodox belief in the unity of God. (Ver. 19; Rom. 2: 17.) For later references, compare Stanley's "Apostolic Age," p. 301, n.

25. Likewise also—better, *and in like manner*. **Was not Rahab the harlot justi-**

by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent *them* out another way?
26 For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also.

received the messengers, and sent them out another
26 way? For as the body apart from the spirit is dead, even so faith apart from works is dead.

CHAPTER III.

MY brethren, be not many masters, knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation.

1 Be not many *of you* teachers, my brethren, know-

fied by works? Rahab was a Gentile, delivered from destruction by a faith which induced her to run the risk of death, in the service of God's people. Hence, her example was memorable. (Heb. 11: 31.) She also belonged to that unhappy class to whom a new hope was imparted by Christ's gracious words in Matt. 21: 31, 32. If Abraham's faith might be regarded as something apart, to which none dared to aspire, then Rahab's might afford an encouraging example. The two represented the divisions of the human race, nationally as Jew and Gentile, socially as male and female. This woman, alien as she was to the blood of Abraham, and depraved as were the masses of the heathen world, was, like Abraham, 'justified by the works of faith.' **When she had received the messengers and sent them out another way.** The narrative style is best preserved by omitting 'had' before the verbs. She entertained the Jewish spies, and, when they were in danger, sent them away with urgent haste, as the verb implies. (Josh. 2: 15, 16.) They were let down by a window on the wall, and so departed by a *different way* from that by which they had entered her house. These acts approved Rahab's faith, and entitled her to the favor of the Israelites. Hence, her life was spared; she was thus formally excepted from the sentence pronounced upon the inhabitants of Jericho. (Josh. 6: 25.) She was made a member of an eminent Jewish family (Matt. 1: 5), and thus became an ancestress of our Lord. Rahab was, doubtless, an innkeeper—a class whose moral character in heathen lands was so infamous that its members were not allowed to enter the Christian churches, except on the condition of changing their occupation. The heathen tavern was a brothel. Compare "Apost. Constitutions," B. VIII., C. 32.

26. For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also. Thus the argument is concluded by repeating the sentence of ver. 17, and adding the figure of a body without the spirit. James describes man popularly as consisting of body and spirit. The latter is the breath of life communicated by the Creator. (Gen. 2: 7; 6: 17; Rev. 11: 11.) When this vital spirit is withdrawn, the man becomes a carcass. As worthless as this decaying, frail semblance of our humanity is faith apart from works. The individual members of the comparison are not to be connected, as if the body corresponded with faith and the spirit with works. The general thought is that an inoperative faith is as worthless as a lifeless carcass. [It may be worthy of notice that there is no article before the word "spirit" in the Greek original. Hence the clause might be translated, "As the body without spirit (or *a spirit*) is dead," etc.; and as the meaning of the expression is entirely satisfactory without adding the article in translation, it is perhaps safer to translate literally.—A. H.]

II. Division.—The Godly in Trial and Temptation should be Slow to Speak. Warning against Sins of the Tongue. 3: 1-12.

1. *Those who transgress in this particular will be the more severely judged.* 1: 1, 2.

1. With this verse begins the second great division of the Epistle, relating to sins of speech, and the collisions and offences against Christian charity caused by an unbridled tongue. The godly, in trial and temptation, should be slow to speak. (3: 1-12.) **My brethren, be not many masters**—that is, teachers. The office of teacher was in such honor among the Jews that many, however ill qualified for its discharge, were eager to assume it. Hence, our Lord's injunction, Matt. 23: 8-10, and Paul's warning, Rom. 2: 17. The same self-pleasing vanity led many to undertake the work of exposition and instruction in the early churches. This vain ostentation of knowledge already had led to wrangling, and produced much disorder, as it did subsequently in the Church at Corinth.

2 For in many things we offend all. If any man offend not in word, the same *is* a perfect man, *and* able also to bridle the whole body.
3 Behold, we put bits in the horses' mouths, that they may obey us; and we turn about their whole body.
4 Behold also the ships, which though *they be* so

2 ing that we shall receive heavier[1] judgment. For in many things we all stumble. If any stumbleth not in word, the same is a perfect man, able to bridle the
3 whole body also. Now if we put the horses' bridles into their mouths, that they may obey us, we turn
4 about their whole body also. Behold, the ships also,

1 Gr. *greater.*

(1 Cor. 14: 29.) The warning is not against teaching; but against the conceit which led the incompetent to set themselves up as teachers, and to swarm into the office. [Says Alford, showing the connection of this exhortation with what precedes it, "*Become not* many teachers." The more the idea prevailed that faith, without corresponding obedience, was all that is needful, the more men would eagerly press forward to teach.—A. H.] Wise is the old Jewish maxim, "Love the work of a teacher; but strive not after the honor." The warning is not against free, mutual exhortation (1 Cor. 14: 26-33), but against the abuse of this privilege by the forward and contentious. **Knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation.** By a sudden change of person James applies the warning to himself also. "Condemnation": literally, *judgment*, usually in the New Testament expresses an adverse decision or a sentence of punishment, as in 2: 13; John 12: 31; 1 Tim. 5: 24. The language of our text seems borrowed from our Lord's warning to the Scribes and Pharisees, the blind and hypocritical guides of the Jews. (Matt. 23: 14.) In such a case, the condemnation is greater than in that of those who do not undertake to teach, because their influence for evil is greater. (John 9: 41.) A solemn thought for those who undertake to teach and rule others, without concerning themselves as to the improvement of their own faulty character and evil lives!

2. For in many things we offend all. The text confirms the last clause of the foregoing verse. We all fail in duty—literally, *stumble;* and so become liable to condemnation; but there is special danger of transgression 'in word,' for the proper management of the tongue requires the highest wisdom. The reference in the first clause of the text is not to the transgressions of teachers or their errors of doctrine, but to the various moral defects belonging to all men. **If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man.** Instead of 'any man,' read *any one.* 'Word' does not relate to teaching only, but to speech in general; Syriac, *discourse.* 'A perfect man' is an adult (1 Cor. 14: 20; Heb. 5: 14), one who has attained the end of his development. As applied to a Christian it indicates one whose moral growth is complete (Heb. 12: 23), and whose trained and vigorous powers are in harmony with the will of God. The control of speech is the evidence that one has attained this standard of Christian manhood. That absolute perfection is not meant is shown by the first clause. **And able to bridle also the whole body.** Omit 'and.' He who controls the tongue has all the other members subject to his command. The desires of the evil heart, which lead to sin (Matt. 15: 19), are represented as pervading the members of the body, and dwelling in them (Rom. 7: 23); but he who has mastered the most reluctant of these organs has already performed the most difficult act of Christian virtue, and is now monarch of himself. In the verb to 'bridle' the metaphor of chapter 1: 26 is recalled.

2. *Reasons for the judgment denounced against the sins of the tongue.* 3: 3–12.

a. The wonderful power of the tongue. 3: 3–6.

b. The power of man, the lord of Nature, to control the tongue. 3: 7–12.

3. That the mastery of the tongue aids the mastery of the whole body is illustrated by a comparison: The case is like that in which we manage horses by bits in the mouth. **Behold** is to be rejected, but the particles which take its place (*but if*) are awkward in English. It would be best to render the whole verse, *When we put bits into the mouths of horses, that they may obey us, we turn about their whole body.* The use of the bit is at once the assertion and the means of mastery: it controls the mouth and the whole creature. As James is treating of the control of the tongue, the figure is happily selected. The moral lesson lies upon the surface of the text. He who has so great and easy a mastery over a brute creature, willful and powerful, should be able to govern himself.

4. Behold calls attention to the second

great, and *are* driven of fierce winds, yet are they turned about with a very small helm, whithersoever the governor listeth.
5 Even so the tongue is a little member, and boasteth great things. Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth!
6 And the tongue *is* a fire, a world of iniquity: so is the tongue among our members, that it defileth the

though they are so great, and are driven by rough winds, are yet turned about by a very small rudder,
5 whither the impulse of the steersman willeth. So the tongue also is a little member, and boasteth great things. Behold [1] how much wood is kindled by how
6 small a fire! And the tongue is [2] a fire: [3] the world of iniquity among our members is the tongue, which

1 Or, *how great a forest*.....2 Or, *a fire, that world of iniquity; the tongue is among our members that which, &c*.....3 Or, *that world of iniquity, the tongue, is among our members that which, &c.*

comparison, which to James must have been the more impressive, as connected with his personal recollections of stormy Galilee. The rudder governs the huge bulk of the ship, even when the vessel is driven by furious winds. The rudder is described as very little, the superlative strengthening the contrast. Like a ship in the tempest is man amid the temptations and trials of life. **Whithersoever the governor listeth**—literally, *whithersoever the desire of the helmsman willeth.* Such is the original, which is given in a condensed form in our version. Etymologically a 'governor' (*gubernator*) is a helmsman, the pilot, who stands at the rudder and guides the ship, and whose resolute will prevails against the violence of revolted nature.

5. Here the comparison is applied to the subject in hand. For **even so** read *so also.* The tongue is a little member of the body, as the rudder is but a small part of the ship. Yet it boasts great things; the idea is, not that the boasting is empty, and that great things are not performed by the tongue, a thought which would be inharmonious with the connection; but that it is so conscious of its power, as to be possessed by arrogant presumption. James here speaks of its boasting great things, rather than of its working great things, because the effects of its power are commonly deplorable, as he immediately proceeds to show. **Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth!** Instead of 'matter,' *pile of materials, forest,* is to be preferred as the primary meaning of the word, and as making the figure much more striking and beautiful; so in the Syriac. It was a common figure among the classic writers. Stobæus says: "A little torch can burn the summit of Ida." Homer speaks of "a spark, scarce seen, which fires a boundless forest." And Virgil draws an animated picture of the desolation resulting from fire dropped by a careless shepherd, which at length reaches the tree tops, "and wraps the forest in a robe of flame." The same figure occurs in Eccles. 11: 32, and frequently in Philo. In its germ it is to be found in Prov. 16: 27. In a country abounding in olive plantations, like Judea, these forest fires were especially destructive; the fire described by Virgil ("Georg." 2: 302-314) originated among the wild olives. Here again James draws a figure from his own experience. And the tongue is a spark that may set families, churches, and societies on fire. [By a change of reading, which has much in its favor, and is adopted by Tischdorf, Tregelles, Alf., Mey., Westcott and Hort, and others, this clause must signify either: "How great a fire, how great a forest does it (viz., the tongue) kindle;" or, "how small a fire kindles how great a forest"—the word which takes the place of "little" before "fire," meaning ordinarily "how great," but sometimes "how small." I prefer the second interpretation: "How small a fire kindles how great a forest!" By omitting 'and' before the clause, Davidson translates: "Behold, how great a fire, how great a wood, does the tongue kindle! A fire, the world of unrighteousness, the tongue sets itself among our members," etc. This is the reading and punctuation of Tischendorf. But the 'and' (καὶ) is supported by the uncials ℵ A B C K L P against ℵ, and should, therefore, be retained.—A. H.]

6. Here the comparison, in the latter part of the foregoing verse is applied. And from the mighty destructive power of the tongue it may be concluded that he who understands how to bridle it has indeed attained a complete and noble manhood. (Ver. 2.) **And the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity.** Such a fire as I have described is the tongue, so insidious and so deadly. When surrendered to evil thoughts, desires, and purposes, it is a world of iniquity, in which every variety of evil finds a place, and exerts its destroying power. In the original, 'world' is emphatic—*that world* or *the world.* **So is the**

whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature; and it is set on fire of hell.
7 For every kind of beasts, and of birds, and of serpents, and of things in the sea, is tamed, and hath been tamed of mankind:

defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the
7 wheel of [1]nature, and is set on fire by hell. For every [2]kind of beasts and birds, of creeping things and things in the sea, is tamed and hath been tamed

1 Or, *birth*.....2 Gr. *nature*.

tongue among our members, that it defileth the whole body. A better rendering would be: *So the tongue among our members is that which defileth*, etc., which, although not precisely literal, expresses nearly enough the sense of the original. [The latest editors omit the word meaning 'so,' as forming no part of the original text. With this omission, Alford translates thus: "The tongue is that one among our members which defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature"; and Davidson thus: "The tongue sets itself among our members, both defiling the whole body, and setting on fire the wheel of life"; and Huther, in Meyer's Commentary, gives a German translation identical in sense with Davidson's.—A. H.] Words are not mere idle breath which go forth and are lost in empty air. The impure or wrathful utterance is infectious to the blood of the utterer—a moral leprosy, influencing all the members and defiling all the actions. **And setteth on fire the course of nature**—better, *the wheel* or *circle of life*. Life is represented as a wheel that is set in motion at our birth and rolls onward. The same figure occurs in Anacreon, "Ode 4."

> For fast away our moments steal
> Like the swift chariot's rolling wheel;
> The rapid course is quickly done,
> And soon the race of life is run;
> Then, then alas! we droop, we die,
> And sunk in dissolution lie.

The inspired writer speaks, as it were, in accents broken by indignation, in representing the terrible mischiefs of the tongue. Now it is a world of iniquity, a fullness of unrighteousness; now the axle upon which the wheel of life revolves and by which it is set on fire. The Syriac translator in striving to smooth the sentence has destroyed much of its spirit. **And it is set on fire of hell**—literally, *being set on fire of Gehenna*. As the fiery tongues of Pentecost were from above, these tongues, burning with unhallowed fire, are kindled from below. And the participle (the present) indicates that the flame is being continually communicated. The word Gehenna appears only in the Synoptic Gospels and here. It was the name of a valley to the west and south of Jerusalem, where children were burned alive by the idolatrous Jews in honor of Moloch, and is supposed from their piercing cries to have received its name, which signifies, "the valley of lamentation." After the horrid rites, once performed there, had been prohibited by Josiah (2 Kings 23: 10), the place became a common, where all the filth of the city was deposited, and the dead bodies of animals were cast and consumed in flames that were kept continually burning. This horrible place was called the Gehenna of Fire, and was a symbol of hell, where the wicked will be punished forever. (Isa. 66: 24; Matt. 5: 22, 29; 10: 28; 18: 9; 23: 15, 33; Mark 9: 43-47; Luke 12: 5.) Hence, the idea of James in our text is that the evil tongue is inflamed by hell, is under the devil's control, is doing his work, and is preparing for his doom.

b. Man as the lord of nature has power to control the tongue. Ver. 7-12.

7. This and the following verse indicate the tameless power of the tongue which, to his disgrace, man, the lord of nature, fails to subdue. **For every kind** (literally, *nature*) **of beasts, and of birds, and of serpents** (*reptiles*), **and of things in the sea, is tamed, and hath been tamed of mankind.** The enumeration is intended to embrace all creatures, those that walk, those that fly, those that crawl, those that swim. So in Gen. 9: 2. Their nature is inferior to man's nature, and does homage to it. He has made the domestic animals his servants, the wild animals his vassals. The horse draws his chariots; but when he wills the lion also submits to the yoke. The hound hunts for him; but if he demands, the cormorants will pursue the fish at his bidding, and the falcon strike his quarry in the air. He can call the timid fish and birds around him, and charm the serpent of its venom, and lure the scaly and savage leviathan from his deeps. History is full of instances in which man's nature has

8 But the tongue can no man tame; *it is* an unruly
evil, full of deadly poison.
9 Therewith bless we God, even the Father; and
therewith curse we men, which are made after the
similitude of God.
10 Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and
cursing. My brethren, these things ought not so to be.

8 [1]by [2]mankind: but the tongue can no man tame;
9 *it is* a restless evil, *it is* full of deadly poison. Therewith bless we the Lord and Father; and herewith
curse we men, who are made after the likeness of
10 God: out of the same mouth cometh forth blessing
and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not
11 so to be. Doth the fountain send forth from the

1 Or, *unto*.....2 Gr. *the human nature*.

thus asserted its power over that of all other creatures. Cassian relates that the Apostle John kept a tame partridge as a pet—a circumstance too frequent to be worthy of mention, except that it associates our text with the history of the disciple whom Jesus loved.

8. But the tongue can no man tame. 'But' introduces a contrast to the preceding verse. 'The tongue' referred to is not that of others, but one's own. Not even the glorious, powerful nature of man can repress its quick sallies and passionate outbursts. In the best it is but imperfectly tamed; in others it exercises an overmastering power. The tongue is personified as a wild creature. **It is an unruly evil, full of deadly poison.** 'It is' does not appear in the original; if left out, the close of the verse would be an exclamation expressive of moral indignation. Instead of 'unruly,' uncontrollable, the best authorities read 'restless,' the same word as in 1: 8. Hermas says: "An evil spirit is calumny and a restless demon." 'Full of deadly poison' may be an echo of Psalm 140: 3, "Adders' poison is under their lips," which Paul quotes in Rom. 3: 13. "A word of evil from the old Serpent consigned our race to death, and, like Satan's tongue, are in a degree the tongues of all his children." And perhaps more destructive than the words of the wicked is the language of wrath, impurity, or impiety, uttered by those who claim to be the disciples of Jesus Christ. The verses immediately ensuing show that James had the case of such wayward and inconsistent brethren especially in view.

9. Notwithstanding the difficulty of controlling it, the misuse of the tongue is inconsistent with the Christian profession, and deeply criminal and malignant. **Therewith bless we God, even the Father.** The best authorities substitute "Lord" instead of 'God,' as in the Syriac; hence it would be better to read *our Lord and Father*. 'Therewith' indicates that the tongue is the means and instrument we employ: it is repeated in the second clause to mark the contrast more distinctly. To 'bless God' is to celebrate his name and acts with praises (Ps. 145: 21), recognizing him as the sovereign and majestic Lord, and the loving and gracious Father. (Matt. 11: 25.) **Therewith curse we men which** (*who*) **are made after the similitude of God.** James associates himself with those whom he addresses, because the sin he is denouncing is the sin of human nature. Yet it is not the less to be reprobated. To wish evil to men who, although defiled by sin, are yet spared by God, and have not finished their probation, is to arrogate to ourselves the right of deciding their destiny. Besides, even the sinner retains the similitude of God. In his intellectual and moral qualities man represents God on earth, has the lordship of nature, and is capable of knowing, loving, and serving the great Creator. (Gen. 1: 26.) As God's noblest creature, and as our neighbor, he should receive from us, not hatred, but love. (Matt. 5: 44.) Even in man's fallen state "an indelible nobility remains." (Bengel.) If he is "the scandal," he is at the same time "the glory of the universe." (Pascal.) Hence he who curses man, sins against the Eternal and Blessed One, who made man, and who rules and loves him. To praise God and curse men with the same tongue is to maintain only the hollow semblance of piety. Thus James condemned the fierce intolerance of his own people, and not less that which, in succeeding centuries, has stained the records of Church history with tears and blood. The most bitter conflicts and crusades of tongue, pen, and sword have been waged on the Jesuitical pretext that they were prosecuted "for the greater glory of God." The frightful massacre of St. Bartholomew, when the streets of Paris ran blood, was celebrated by a *Te Deum* at Rome. A medal struck to commemorate the event bore the inscription: "Piety excited justice."

10. Out of the same mouth. The passage

11 Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet *water* and bitter?
12 Can the fig tree, my brethren, bear olive berries? either a vine, figs? so *can* no fountain both yield salt water and fresh.

12 same opening sweet *water* and bitter? can a fig tree, my brethren, yield olives, or a vine figs? neither *can* salt water yield sweet.

repeats in brief what has just been said. The emphasis is on 'same.' In Hebrew, the word for blessing and cursing is the same; hence it is a question among translators whether the appeal of Job's wife to the afflicted patriarch is ironical, "Bless God and die"; or is a cry of indignation and despair, "Curse God and die." [The Revised Version translates Job 2: 9: "Then said his wife unto him, Dost thou still hold fast thine integrity? *renounce* God, and die"—that is, *bid farewell to God, and die.*—A. H.] The tongue, as it were with one effort, can utter either a blessing or a curse, or both. But God has consecrated it to the kindly work of blessing. To use it both for cursing and blessing is to contravene the design of its Maker and the order of nature, and to pervert the precious and sacred gift of speech. The warning added is presented in the form of a general maxim. (Winer.)

11. The unnaturalness of the course reprobated is illustrated by a figure. **Send forth at the same place**—literally, *spurt forth at the same orifice.* 'The place' is the opening in the rock, through which the spring water gushes. **Sweet water and bitter**—literally, *the sweet and the bitter.* 'Water' is understood. Palestine is a land abounding in springs (Deut. 8: 7), many of which, however, are impregnated with mineral substances, as salt and sulphur. The springs on the hill country of Judea, sloping toward the Dead Sea, are brackish, and so are many others: Plumptre: "Compare the sweetening of the spring which supplied the college of the sons of the prophets (2 Kings 2: 19), and the symbolic healing of the waters. (Ezek. 47: 9.)" The opening at the fountain corresponds to the mouth, and the stream to the tongue, or the flow of speech; the uniformity of nature's inarticulate language condemns the man from whose mouth comes blessing and cursing. His course has no analogue in nature.

12. Another local comparison shows the impossibility of reconciling these opposites. The same truth is taught in Matt. 7: 16, 17: "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" The idea is that the product in every case must correspond to the cause or kind from which it springs. Hence, the same source cannot produce opposites. **Can the fig tree bear olive berries? either a vine figs?** The vine and fig tree were common in every Oriental courtyard. (2 Kings 18: 31.) The olives abounded, and they gave its name to the height which, on the east, overlooked Jerusalem. These various gifts of Providence, for which the Jews were wont to praise God, are indicated as familiar instances to prove that nothing can produce aught that is contrary to its own nature. **So can no fountain both yield salt water and fresh.** The best authorities read, Neither can salt water (in the spring) yield fresh. [Alford: "Neither can salt water bring forth sweet"; Davidson: "Neither can salt water bear sweet"; Bible Union: "Neither can salt water yield fresh." I do not find any word signifying "fountain," "spring" in the text, which appears to have the best support. The Revised Version, it will be observed, reads, "Neither *can* salt water yield sweet," and this is probably the best rendering of the Greek.—A. H.] In this declaration something more is meant than the unnaturalness of the conjunction of blessing and cursing, which is indicated in the previous verse. The conjunction is impossible; blessing and cursing cannot issue from the same lips. Those who curse men cannot praise God. The blessing is hypocritical, and hence distasteful to him to whom it is rendered; it is flavored and "tainted with the bitterness of the cursing"; it is not praise at all. Johnstone: "An unrenewed heart is a deep well of bitterness, and salt water cannot yield fresh."

III. DIVISION, 3: 13–4: 17. THE GODLY UNDER TRIAL AND TEMPTATION SHOULD BE SLOW TO WRATH AND ITS KINDRED IMPULSIVE PASSIONS. Compare note on 4: 1.

1. *Gentleness and moderation of Christian wisdom depicted.* 3: 13–18.

13. In this verse begins the third general division of the Epistle, containing the development of the admonition of 1: 19, "Slow to wrath." The discussion extends to the conclusion of chapter 4. The first paragraph of the division (ver. 13-18) discriminates between

13 Who *is* a wise man and endued with knowledge among you? let him shew out of a good conversation his works with meekness of wisdom.
14 But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not against the truth.

13 Who is wise and understanding among you? let him shew by his good life his works in meekness of
14 wisdom. But if ye have bitter jealousy and faction in your heart, glory not and lie not against the
15 truth. This wisdom is not *a wisdom* that cometh

the false and the true wisdom. The false wisdom was the kind of which James' readers boasted, and which, they supposed, qualified them to be teachers in the house of God. (3: 1.) **Who is a wise man, and endued with knowledge among you?** Literally, *Who is wise and knowing*. The direct question, with its immediate answer, gives vivacity to the discourse. There is a like construction in Ps. 34: 12–14. The synonyms "wise and knowing" occur also in Deut. 1: 13; 4: 6, Septuagint, where they indicate the qualifications of those who are competent to exercise authority. Compare also the description of the false teachers of Isa. 5: 20, 21, who were "wise in their own eyes and prudent in their own sight," who called "evil good and good evil"; who "put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter." It would seem that James had this passage in his mind. (3: 11.) He addressed those who claimed to have the moral character and the intellectual accomplishments which qualified them to be teachers in the church, and indicated to them what outward tests must indicate these claims. **Let him shew out of a good conversation his works.** As 'conversation,' in the sense in which it occurs here, is obsolete, *conduct* should be substituted, as it should be in so many other passages. (Ps. 37: 14; Gal. 1: 13; 1 Peter 1: 15.) Let him show by good conduct his works, as the expressive manifestations of wisdom; so some. Others, with Neander, interpret 'works' as in apposition with "conduct"—"works performed in the gentleness expressive of wisdom." The **meekness of wisdom** is the gentleness characteristic of wisdom, and proceeding from it. According to this last interpretation, which we prefer, the text would read, *Let him show this, in his good conduct—his works in meekness of wisdom.* The works of this sort would be the sign required, instead of the conceited and contentious self-assertion in which these teachers abounded. He who has true wisdom is apt to say but little about himself, and is willing even to sacrifice his own pretensions in the interest of peace.

14. But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts. So different from the meekness of wisdom was the temper of those whom James addressed. 'Envy' may easily assume the name of religious zeal; it was indeed the temper of the Jews against the Gentile converts (Acts 13: 45), and would be more naturally cherished by one aspiring teacher against another. As the word in the original has also a good meaning (like the English word zeal which comes from it), **bitter** is introduced to indicate its true character here. 'Strife' may be rendered *factiousness, party-spirit*—a temper so injurious to Christian fellowship, and so troublesome to the early churches. It was the besetting sin of the Jews (Rom. 2: 8; 10: 3; Acts 7: 51), and it greatly disturbed the churches of Corinth (2 Cor. 12: 20), Galatia, (Gal. 5: 20), and Rome. (Phil. 1: 15.) It is the temper of hirelings (as the etymology of the word indicates) and of political candidates—not that becoming the disciples of the meek and lowly Jesus. 'Heart' (singular in the Greek) is in contrast with the speech of teachers boasting of their wisdom. **Glory not, and lie not against the truth.** Glorying has reference to others over whom we esteem ourselves to have the advantage. Thus the Jews gloried over the Gentiles; pluming themselves over their superior religious privileges, while abusing them, and saying: "This people who have not the Law are cursed." And thus in their turn the Gentiles afterward gloried over the Jews. (Rom. 11: 18.) Both needed to know that in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availed anything, nor uncircumcision; but a new creature. Lying against the truth has reference to the doctrine which they themselves acknowledged, yet which they repudiated by their partialities and hostilities against their own brethren. It was no single truth they opposed, such as "the brotherhood of mankind in Christ," as in the claim (Rom. 3: 29), that God was the God of the Jews only; but they rejected the whole gospel of love, meekness, and long suffering, in making the Christian communion a theatre of envy and partisanship. This was a misrepresentation of the truth of God, and a hindrance to its advancement.

15 This wisdom descendeth not from above, but *is* earthly, sensual, devilish.
16 For where envying and strife *is*, there *is* confusion and every evil work.

down from above, but is earthly, [1] sensual, demoniacal. 16 For where jealousy and faction are, there is 17 confusion and every vile deed. But the wisdom that

1 Or, *natural*; or, *animal*.

15. In this and the next verse the character of false wisdom is indicated: **This wisdom descendeth not from above**—better, *This wisdom is not that which descendeth from above.* True wisdom is heavenly in its origin and spirit, and is won by prayer. (1: 5.) But the wisdom vaunted (ver. 14) has another character and another source. **But is earthly, sensual, devilish.** These three adjectives form a climax. Instead of coming 'from above,' the wisdom designated here rather and only belongs to *earth*, as indeed we find its expressions everywhere in secular life, among the societies of unregenerate men. (Phil. 3: 19.) How different this from that heavenly wisdom displayed in the history of Jesus Christ! 'Sensual.' This is perhaps a good translation here; for no word which precisely answers the original exists in English. The term is rendered in Jude 19, as here, "sensual." In 1 Cor. 15: 44, and 2: 14, it is rendered, "natural." The Syriac paraphrases it, "from the devices of the soul." It applies to man as an animal, whose mental and emotional nature corresponds to and is apt to be engrossed by the interests and pleasures of the world. The subject is unfolded largely by Ellicott's "Destiny of the Creature," pp. 99–120, and is popularly, yet satisfactorily, set forth in President Hopkins' "Strength and Beauty," p. 176, seq. Perhaps our word, *carnal*, would most nearly express the true meaning. The wisdom referred to is carnal, as it harmonizes with the depraved desires and affections, and proceeds from them. It is carnal, as it arises in the impulses of a nature which has not yet received from the Spirit of God a higher life that apprehends God, communes with him, and lives under the influence of an unseen world. (1 Thess. 5: 23.) Conscience, unselfish philanthropy and faith lie beyond the sphere of carnal and secular wisdom. Further, this wisdom is 'devilish'—literally, *demoniacal*, like that of the unclean spirits, who took possession even of the bodies of men in those days. James alludes to the demons more than once (2: 19), for he himself had seen their unhappy victims. And now, in the bickerings, the envies, the bitter conflicts, the egotistical boastings, the crafty intrigues, and the false doctrines of those who wished to be teachers, he detected the demons in their endeavor to take possession of the body of Christ. The Apostle Paul instances some of the doctrines of demons, by which the faith and harmony of the Gentile churches was assailed. (1 Tim. 4: 1-5.)

NOTE.—Cremer (p. 625) remarks that the three predicates—earthly, sensual, devilish—express a logical sequence and enhancement; earthly as the fit antithesis of 'from above;' because earthly, therefore sensual (1 Cor. 15: 48); therefore also destitute of the Spirit; and because destitute of the Spirit actually opposed thereto—that is, devilish.

16. For where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work. A confirmation of the judgment pronounced against the false wisdom. It is condemned by its evil results. 'Envying and strife' may be rendered, as in ver. 14, *envy and party spirit.* The result of the indulgence of these unhallowed sentiments is a destruction of harmony, a society in disorder and uproar, a chaotic turbulence, which cannot come from God—for God is not the author of confusion, but of peace. (1 Cor. 14: 33.) Parallel to our text is Prov. 26: 28, Septuagint, where the original for the word "ruin" is the same as that rendered by 'confusion' in our text. A flattering mouth worketh "ruin." There is a tone of contempt in the expression **every evil,** or *vile* **deed.** It indicates something base and shameful, as in John 3: 20, involving distress of conscience and scandal before the world. As all history proves, envy and partisanship have no respect to moral considerations. This spirit, now, alas! threatening the peace of our Republic, once wrought the ruin of the world.

17. The true wisdom is now described as to its spirit and expressions. What its character and value are is implied in the expression, **That is from above.** It is heavenly. (Prov. 2: 6.) "The Lord giveth wisdom." **Pure.** This is the eminent characteristic of heavenly wisdom; it is, first of all, chaste and

17 But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, *and* easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.
18 And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace.

17 But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits,
18 without [1] variance, without hypocrisy. And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace [2] for them that make peace.

1 Or, *doubtfulness*; or, *partiality*.....2 Or, *by*.

stainless, free from any kind of vice, (2 Cor. 7:11; Titus 2:5) in contrast with the wisdom that is sensual. (Ver. 15.) **Peaceable.** Peace follows after purity here, as in the Sermon on the Mount. (Matt. 5:8, 9.) The wisdom that is free from vice and self-seeking ever tends to harmony and concord. The practical effect of this temper is shown in the next verse, which indicates that James had the Sermon on the Mount in mind. Compare Matt. 5:9. Peace may well be valued by believers, as Christ's special gift (Col. 1:20); as a spirit which composes earth's discords, while it allies earth with heaven. **Gentle,** or mild and forbearing (1 Tim. 3:3); the corresponding noun is rendered "moderation" (Phil. 4:5), "a readiness to waive all rigor and severity" (Conybeare); a willingness rather to suffer wrong than to provoke or perpetuate strife. Thus it is closely connected with 'peaceable.' **Easy to be entreated**—tractable, ready to yield, easily persuaded by advice and correction, perhaps also gaining its ends by persuasion. **Full of mercy and good fruits**—rich in the fruits of love, for love to man produces mercy (1:27; 2:13), and love to God is displayed in the manifold activities of a consecrated life. The good fruits are the contrast to every vile deed. (Ver. 16.) **Without partiality, and without hypocrisy** indicate the same qualities as the previous phrase, but couched in a negative form. The mercy of heavenly wisdom is not chilled by human respects, and its good fruits are not sacrificed to secular interests, and supplanted by pious semblances. Those whom James addressed were, many of them, partial in their dealings with men, and hypocritical in their conduct toward God. These various qualities here commended belong to the truly wise; hence, they are ascribed to wisdom itself.

18. Only where this heavenly wisdom is can the results which Christians are appointed to accomplish be realized. **The fruit of righteousness,** not the fruit which is righteousness—a genitive of apposition (Huther)—but the fruit produced by righteousness. This fruit is regarded as containing in itself seed, which being planted produces a harvest of a similar kind. **Peace** is the condition upon which its successful cultivation depends. So that the gentle wisdom, which has just been described, is not only excellent in itself, but is necessary for the promotion of the cause of truth and virtue on earth. **Of them that make peace**—better, *by those who.* The peacemaker is the successful sower of the immortal seed. "The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God." Johnstone: "Love is the true spirit of the herald of the God of love." In regard to this portraiture of true wisdom, as compared with Paul's picture of love, 1 Cor. 13, Plumptre remarks: "Differing as the two teachers did, in many ways, in their modes of thought and language, one fastening on the more practical, the other on the more spiritual aspects of the truth, there was an essential agreement in their standard of the highest form of the Christian character. One teacher held out the right hand of fellowship to the other. (Gal. 2:9.) Love is Wisdom, and Wisdom is love." This verse is in contrast with ver. 16, where the harvest sown by ambition and contention is indicated.

NOTE.—The peculiar form of the Greek implies not only that the work is performed by the persons referred to, but that the result is to be enjoyed by them. The dative implies possession. (Winer.) Angus, "Ann. Bib.": "Ambition and strife have their fruit (ver. 16); so the work of peace has righteousness for its fruit, 'sown' now, to be enjoyed forever." Compare Matt. 5:9.

CHAPTER IV.

FROM whence *come* wars and fightings among you? *come they* not hence, *even* of your lusts that war in your members?

1 Whence *come* wars and whence *come* fightings among you? *come they* not hence, *even* of your pleas-
2 ures that war in your members? Ye lust, and have

2. *Warning against the sway of the passions.* 4: 1–17.

a. Evil consequences of the passions (ver. 1–3): They engender strife (ver. 1); they are illusive (ver. 2); and they deprive prayer of its efficacy. (Ver. 3.)

1. In this chapter, the earnest warnings against the indulgence of selfish and carnal desires are continued. There can be no peace in a nature or in a community where the passions are unbridled. **From whence come wars and fightings among you?** Omit 'from'; repeat 'whence' before 'fightings,' and read, *Whence come wars, whence fightings?* 'Wars' indicate a chronic state of disturbance, 'fightings,' the daily dissensions and quarrels; the two serve to indicate how deplorable was the condition of the churches addressed; they were like tumultuous battlefields. The language expresses the lively emotion of the writer. Notice the bold transition from 3: 18, and the question, 'Whence and whence?' **Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?** The negative interrogatory occurs as an answer in the affirmative. 'Hence' designates the thing meant as if with outstretched finger; then follows the indication in words. 'Lusts,' in the original, *pleasures*, used by metonymy for the desires they awaken. (Luke 8: 14.) These were the cause of the discords and strife prevailing in the churches ('among you'), and disturbing the peace of individual Christians. Their lusts were, as it were, encamped or arranged for battle in the members. They availed themselves of every sense and organ, as a vantage ground for carrying on the war against the soul (1 Peter 2: 11; Rom. 7: 23; 6: 12, 13), and against the peaceful fellowship and beneficent work of believers in the church relation. The Jews of this age were divided into bitter sects and relentless factions. The accounts given by Josephus of their vindictiveness and blood-thirstiness and rapacity toward each other seem well nigh incredible. Even the danger of the extinction of their nationality did not serve to reconcile them; but they continued to despoil and slaughter each other even when the Roman battering rams were thundering at the gates of Jerusalem.

NOTE.—That the *passions* are included under this general division, which relates specifically to *wrath*, need awaken no surprise, for "wrath" (ὀργή) had a similar scope to that of our word passion. It originally indicated any passionate emotion (according to its root), any impulse, even that of love. Hence, it occurs in the phrase "to turn one's *affections* (ὀργὰς) toward any one." Compare Tholuck, "Serm. on Mount," Matt. 5: 21, 22. Historically and psychologically all the passions are vitally connected, especially those here referred to—vindictiveness and voluptuousness. Suetonius' "Lives of the Cæsars" illustrates this truth; also the story of John of Leyden, the excesses of the French Revolution, and so many other historic instances. A word in Latin corresponding to the Greek term (we refer to the word *ira*) is used by the Roman poets to signify *spirit*. Consult the origin, with its twofold meaning, of our word *orgies*, whose relationship indeed to *orgé* (wrath) can be seen at a glance. The classical reader will recall in this connection the orgies of the Bacchanalia—the frightful mysteries of license and murder, discovered and suppressed at Rome. Livy, "Hist." B 39, §§ 8–19.

2. The sad consequences of these lusts are now depicted. (Ver. 2, 3.) **Ye lust and have not.** The progress of sin from desire to act is here depicted in a style similar to that employed in 1: 15. There, however, it is described as producing death in the transgressor; here as producing war in the church. How hostility to man arises from licentious or covetous desire is illustrated in the history of David, and Ahab. (2 Sam. 11: 1, 2; 1 Kings 21: 2-4.) The lust here is a desire for worldly goods and pleasures. In these respects many supposed that the people of God ought to have the advantage over others. Hence, they were offended by persecutions; they were obsequious to the wealthy, as persons whom God favored. The rich, instead of helping the poor, despised them; and, instead of exercis-

2 Ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not.
3 Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume *it* upon your lusts.
4 Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that 3 not: ye kill, and [1] covet, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war; ye have not, because ye ask not. Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye 4 may spend *it* in your pleasures. Ye [2] adulteresses,

1 Gr. *are jealous*.....2 That is, *who break your marriage vow to God.*

ing diligence in giving, employed diligence in gaining more. And the poor envied the rich, and reproached them as worldlings. Yet in neither case did the eager desire secure the possession of what it craved. **Ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain.** 'Kill,' in the sense of intense and murderous hate, as in 1 John 3: 15. Plumptre, however, takes it literally, and supports the interpretation by the state of Jewish society, of which Barabbas, the bandit, was a type (Mark 15: 7; John 18: 39, 40), the four thousand men that were murderers (Acts 21: 38), and the bands of zealots and Sicarii who were prominent in the tumults of the final war with Rome. The objection to this view is that such atrocities could scarcely have been harbored *in the churches* to which James was writing, however rife they might be in Jewish society. But the desire which awakened hostility to others, however it might express itself in word or deed, failed of its end: "Ye kill and covet, and cannot obtain." Syriac: "It cometh not into your hand." **Ye fight and war.** This is the condition to which lust consigns its votaries; it disappoints them, and makes them mutual tormentors. **Yet ye have not, because ye ask not.** Omit 'yet.' The discontent that they had arose from their neglect of prayer. A contented and a happy lot is the gift of God. (Phil. 4: 6, 7.) Even for earthly goods we are encouraged to pray by the promises of God. Yet the prayer that prevails with God must be dictated by his Spirit. (Ver. 3.) He gives no audience to hatred, covetousness, and envy, when these passions even assume the guise of the virtues, and prostrate themselves before the mercy seat.

3. Ye ask, and receive not, becaus eye ask amiss. Here James explains what he had just said. It was true that the forms of devotion were observed; but these wicked petitions were not entitled to the name of prayer. Hence they received no answer. **That ye may consume it upon** (Syriac, "pamper") **your lusts.** The fault was not in the desire for temporal blessings, for relief and comfort in the present life; but in the end for which such blessings were sought—to pamper the appetites and passions. To consume (Mark 5: 26) is here used in a bad sense—to *squander*. Earthly blessings may be sought for our own good, or that of others; but not to satisfy what is lowest in our nature, and to strengthen what was against the soul. Monstrous as is the thought that the Holy One will minister to our lusts, the hope is cherished by many in every age. The Italian bandit offers prayer for success in his career of villainy, and so does the Cornish wrecker; and in the case of other inconsistent and rejected worshipers, the danger may be the greater, just because the anomaly is less flagrant. But the most singular of all the perversions of prayer was its use by so many mystical saints of the Middle Ages, to inflame their sensual imaginations with amorous raptures—a profanation of the divine love and beauty which still prevails in the common language of the convent. Baring Gould, "Origin and Development of Religion," I., 360-362. The language employed by the most eloquent of all the mystics ("Vie de St. Thérèse," XXIX., 2) we dare not quote, although it is cited with enthusiasm by Balmes' "Protestantism and Catholicity," p. 427.

b. Ungodliness of the passions. Ver. 4–6. They involve enmity to God (ver. 4); and they contemn his word. Ver. 5, 6.

4-6. James has indicated the ungodly nature of these desires (ver. 4-6), in which the disorders of the early churches originated. Instead of **Ye adulterers and adulteresses,** the best authorities read, "Ye adulteresses." The word is used in the figurative meaning familiar to the Jews, indicating apostasy from God. (Ps. 73: 27; Isa. 57: 3 seq.; Ezek. 23: 27; Hosea 2: 2, 4. Matt. 12: 39; 16: 4; 2 Cor. 11: 2; Rev. 2: 4.) The use of the feminine is not to be explained by the fact that James was thinking of adulterous *souls*, whose unfaithfulness to God was like that of a wife to her husband; or that he intended to stigmatize them as effeminate

the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God.
5 Do ye think that the scripture saith in vain, The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy?

know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? Whosoever therefore would be a friend of the world maketh himself an enemy
5 of God. Or think ye that the scripture [1] speaketh in vain? [2] Doth the spirit which [3] he made to
6 dwell in us long unto envying? But he giveth

1 Or, *saith in vain*.....2 Or, *The spirit which he made to dwell in us he yearneth for even unto jealous envy.* Or, *That spirit which he made to dwell in us yearneth* for us *even unto jealous envy*.....3 Some ancient authorities read *dwelleth in us.*

(women rather than men); but rather because he had in view the *churches*, whose love of the world dishonored God, and was a breach of the covenant they had made with him. [In supposing that James here addresses churches instead of individuals, the author agrees with several good commentators; but we fail to see any valid reason for the supposition. The preceding verses are evidently addressed to persons, rather than to churches as such, and if the reference here is to a turning away from God to the service of sinful passions, it is natural to suppose that the writer has in view men rather than ecclesiastical societies. That the feminine is used is due to the fact that Christians, whether men or women, are conceived of as the spouse of God. —A. H.] **Know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God?**—better, *friendship with the world.* The world, with its seductive objects, its ungodly multitudes, and the principles by which its course is directed, is an empire revolted from God and under the control of his adversary. (1 John 2: 15; 5: 19.) Hence, devotion to it is incompatible with allegiance to God. (Matt. 6: 24; Luke 16: 13.) The idea of friendship with the world implies conformity with worldly examples, the pursuit of honor and riches as supremely desirable ends, and a prevailing and paramount desire for the favor of the world—a course incompatible with the discharge of the duties due to God. (James 1: 27; Rom. 12: 2.) The text is an allusion to Christ's declaration in Matt. 6: 24. The same doctrine also inculcates in Rom. 8: 7. **Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God.** A conclusion drawn from the principle just asserted. He who is "*minded* to be" (compare Matt. 11: 19), or who "*desires* to be" a friend of the world ('will' here is something more than a mere auxiliary), and hence adopts a worldly policy, and cultivates worldly fervor and associations; '*becometh*' the enemy of God. The principle involves and necessitates antagonism to God's will; a heart set upon the world must be averse to religion. It was precisely this antagonism between the world and God's kingdom which drove the apostles from Jerusalem, and laid upon James the weighty responsibility of the Jerusalem pastorate. (Acts 12: 17.) Baumgarten's "Apos. Hist.," § 20. Instead of "becometh," Cremer translates, "takes the character or condition, comes forward, appears," p. 303. [There is no article before the word 'enemy' in the Greek, and there seems to be no good reason for inserting it in English. The meaning of James may be thus expressed: 'Whosoever therefore makes it his choice or pleasure to be a friend of the world, takes his position as an enemy of God.'—A. H.]

5. The spirit of the world is condemned by the express teachings of God in his word. (Ver. 5: 6.)

Do ye think that the scripture saith (it) **in vain**—speaks falsely or emptily. As this form of expression would seem to indicate a quotation, the words immediately succeeding have been diligently sought for in the Old Testament, but they cannot be found there. They are not in Scripture, nor, according to our view, did James intend to quote any other Scripture than that occurring in the next verse, "God resisteth the proud, etc." (Prov. 3: 34.) This quotation is suspended until James in his prompt and spirited way mentions and answers an objection. The meaning will be made clear by repeating 'do you think' before the second clause of the verse, as introducing the opinion of a world-loving and self-excusing objector. **The spirit that dwelleth within us** (the better authorities read, *which he planted in us*) **lusteth to envy** (*enviously*). Do you say this, laying the charge of your worldly rivalries and animosities and discontents upon your Creator? Do you claim that an infirmity of nature, for which you are in no wise responsible, *constrains* you to feel and to live as the world does? The Holy Spirit is not intended here,

6 But he giveth more grace. Wherefore he saith, God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble.

[1]more grace. Wherefore *the scripture* saith, God

1 Gr. *a greater grace.*

and indeed is referred to nowhere in the Epistle, which deals almost exclusively with Christian ethics in contrast with Christian theology. Nor can the idea of "envious lusting," or longing, be properly associated with the Spirit of all grace. Such a connection is harsh, and without any Scriptural warrant. But there can be no objection to identifying the indwelling spirit with man's corrupt will (compare 3: 16), for which, however, the worldly-minded professor pleads that he is not responsible. The last clause of this verse and the first of the next are thrown in parenthetically. See a similar example in 4: 14, and note on that verse.

NOTE.—The only other admissible interpretation of this difficult passage is that which finds the Scriptural quotation already given in the previous verse cited here without being repeated: "Do ye think that the Scripture saith this in vain?" Those whom James addressed "knew" from the Scripture (ver. 4) that there was opposition between God and the world. God had put enmity between the seed of woman and the seed of the serpent from the time of the first temptation. (Gen. 3: 15.) And the entire inspired history is but a narration of the successive incidents of this ancient, irreconcilable conflict. Now it finds expression in the avowals of worshipers, Ps. 139: 21, "Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate thee? and am I not grieved with them that rise up against thee?" Now it is proclaimed in the stern remonstrances of prophets. (2 Chron. 19: 2.) "Shouldst thou help the ungodly and love them that hate the Lord? Therefore is wrath upon thee from the Lord." James may have had reference either to this pervasive doctrine of Scripture, or else to some special text such as those we have quoted. If, as is not unlikely, Matthew's Gospel, which was specially addressed to the Jews, was then in circulation among them, the reference may have been directly to our Lord's declaration recorded there. (Matt. 6: 24.) "No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." This last reference, which Benson favors, fits the connection easily. In the previous verse James had alluded to the antagonism between the world and God, as a truth of which his hearers had already been apprised. Then, upon the present supposition, he adds: Do you think that the Scripture saith this falsely? In opposition to the divine testimony, Do ye argue that the spirit of passionate envy, which disturbs your peace of mind and your church fellowship (ver. 1), has been implanted in you by God, and therefore cannot be contrary to his will? The error here advanced James had already confuted (1: 13-18) by showing that it is contradicted by human experience and by the divine perfections. Accordingly, he contents himself now with showing that the infirmity of spirit is no justification of envy and strife. He says: God has given you grace superior to the lusts of nature; he has made provision for your relief in spiritual conflict. You have but to humble yourselves before him, in order to be delivered from envy and vain glory toward your fellows. (Ver. 6.)

[De Wette supposes that the word spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα) here means the Holy Spirit who dwells in the hearts of Christians and loves them even to envy—that is, loves them with such ardor as to be envious, *humanly* speaking, of any hold which the world has on their affections. He would translate the passage thus: *Or do ye suppose that the Scripture saith* (this in ver. 4) *in vain? Unto envy doth the Spirit which he caused to dwell in us love* (us). *But he giveth greater grace* (than if he did not thus love us). I should hesitate to pronounce this an impossible sense.—A. H.]

6. But he giveth (*the*) **more grace**—Syriac, "Superior grace." Thus, almost in a word, does James crush the objection. Man's infirmity is no excuse for his transgressions, for God adapts his gifts of grace precisely to the needs of those who require and ask his succor. To those whose need is greatest the largest measure of grace is given. Thus the way is prepared for the quotation he has promised; the connection requires that **wherefore he saith** should be rendered wherefore *it* (*the*

7 Submit yourselves therefore to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you.
8 Draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you. Cleanse *your* hands, *ye* sinners; and purify *your* hearts, *ye* doubleminded.

resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble.
7 Be subject therefore unto God; but resist the devil,
8 and he will flee from you. Draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you. Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye doubleminded.

Scripture) *saith*, which introduces the suspended quotation. **God resisteth the proud but giveth grace to the humble.** The proud are those who seek for worldly advancement and mind high things (Rom. 12: 16), and who therefore shrink from the reproaches and sacrifices connected with fidelity to the gospel. But in thus seeking worldly gains and glories, under whatever pretext, they incur the loss of the divine favor. The humble are those who, whatever may be their earthly station, recognize their spiritual weakness and poverty, and condescend to men of low estate. They cheerfully assume the cross of Christ, and trustfully rely upon God for strength and wisdom. And to these the grace they need is given. We may judge that this text was a favorite one among the early believers from its being quoted by Peter as well as James. (1 Peter 5: 5.)

c. Means of overcoming the passions. Ver. 7–10.

7–10. The practical conclusion follows. The submission to God is all that is needed to relieve the infirmities of nature, and to give victory in the sorest spiritual conflicts. The appeal is not to the proud (ver. 6) only (Huther), but to all. Nor is the submission that of obedience only, but rather of dependence and trust. They who put themselves under God's care and government will find mercy and grace for every day of need. (But) **Resist the devil and he will flee from you.** [The word "but" should be inserted before "resist," according to the best editors and the earliest MSS. ℵ A B.—A. H.] You need fear nothing from the enmity of the world, not even if it be impersonated in its prince. To resist God is ungrateful and rebellious folly; to oppose each other is to turn the Christian household into an arena of painful and inglorious strife. If you would show your manhood, arm yourselves against the devil, the author of all evil desires, especially of that presumption through which he himself fell, and to which he now tempts, in order that he may destroy you. If you must fight, if you aspire to glory, choose a foeman worthy of the steel; fight Satan, the malignant enemy of God and man. There may be, as Plumptre suggests, an indirect reference here to the history of our Lord's temptation. As Christ was prepared by gifts of the Spirit for that dread encounter, so the tempted believer may be assured that God will impart all the grace he needs (ver. 6) for success in his spiritual conflicts. In this passage James gives an additional proof of the truth of the principle laid down in 1: 14. As God is not the Author of sin (1: 13), neither on the other hand can Satan betray into sin without the consent of the human will. Man's moral nature, when submissive to the control and guidance of the Holy Spirit, is unconquerable by all the arts and arms of hell. The right of direct appeal to God's word and his throne for grace and guidance (misnamed the right of private judgment) is clearly implied in the passage.

8. To the last admonition succeeds another, which also has a promise connected with it. **Draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you.** God's fellowship is sought by repentance, faith, and prayer. Drawing nigh to God indicates a trustful and habitual resort to God amid life's trials and temptations, and pledges divine help to those who thus approach him. The verb occurs in Hosea 12: 6, "Wait on" thy God continually. A similar lesson is given in 2 Chron. 15: 2; Isa. 57: 15; Zech. 1: 3. It is not the same as "walking with God," like Enoch (Gen. 5: 24), although he who draws nigh unto God will also walk with him, and show in character and life the effect of so high an association. **Cleanse your hands, ye sinners, and purify your hearts, ye doubleminded.** This is added to show that something more than acts of devotion are necessary; the conduct must correspond to the profession. Nor did the cere monial ablutions of the Pharisees suffice Even the heathen Seneca knew that "no sea, no rivers can cleanse the right hand stained with crime and blood." The 'sinners' who were serving the lusts of the world (ver. 4) must cease to do evil and learn to do good (Ps. 24: 4.) The **doubleminded** (1: 8; Syriac, "divided in mind"), who, while they wav

9 Be afflicted, and mourn, and weep: let your laughter be turned to mourning, and *your* joy to heaviness.
10 Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall lift you up.

9 Be afflicted, and mourn, and weep; let your laughter be turned to mourning, and your joy to heaviness.
10 Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall exalt you.

ered, showed that their hearts rather belonged to the world than to God, must submit their hearts to the influence of a Divine Spirit, and cultivate unfeigned love for the brethren. (1 Peter 1: 22.) True piety is chastity of spirit; in its inner sanctuary God alone is shrined. The best comment on this passage is found in the Sermon on the Mount, where our Lord condemns the double-mindedness of the Pharisees. (Matt. 6: 19-34.) "They professed to have their hearts set on heaven, while yet they were engaged in laying up for themselves treasures on earth. But where the treasure is, there will the heart be also. (Ver. 19-21.) Their *eye* was not single in its aim, and therefore their spiritual vision was clouded and obscure. (Ver. 22, 23.) They attempted to reconcile the incompatible services of two opposite masters—God and Mammon. (Ver. 24.) They were cumbered and anxious about the things of this world, instead of seeking as their first and great concern the kingdom of God and his righteousness with the simple faith that all other things necessary would be added unto them." (Ver. 25-34.) (Forbes' "Scripture Parallelism," 217, 218.) [The brevity of the original is very spirited, viz.: "*Cleanse hands, sinners; purify hearts, double-minded*"; or supplying ye: "*Cleanse hands, ye sinners; purify hearts, ye double-minded.*"—A. H.]

9. Repentance is the way of return to God. This sorrow for sin is described and emphasized by three words. **Be afflicted**—spoken primarily of bearing external trouble, here for the sense of distress, as in Rom. 7: 24: "O wretched man that I am." It is incorrectly referred by Grotius to bodily austerities, which in themselves have no religious value. **Mourn and weep.** These words are frequently found together, as in Neh. 8: 9; Mark 16: 10. The Jews rent their garments, and used sackcloth and ashes in sign of mourning; and tears express grief in all ages and among all peoples. Here, as in the texts to which allusion is made (Luke 6: 21, 25), the sign is employed for the thing signified. **Let your laughter be turned to mourning, and your joy to heaviness.** Let the consciousness of your eternal wretchedness eclipse the joys which life's seeming prosperities awaken, and thus work repentance and salvation. (2 Cor. 7: 10.) The external change from laughter to mourning is a figure for the change of feeling, as the last clause shows. **Heaviness**—dejection, such as is shown in casting down the eyes in shame. The worldly pleasures they had sought for and enjoyed should produce a sense of shame and deep distress before God. (Prov. 10: 23.) The passage recalls the figure of the Publican (Luke 18: 13), who "would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven"—not, indeed, to commend the attitude, but the penitential sorrow it expressed. In the second half of the verse is exhibited the parallelism of members, the well-known peculiarity of Hebrew poetry, which occurs also in the New Testament when the style rises to the elevation of rhythm. The parallelism is sometimes synonymous as here, and sometimes antithetic. (Winer.) The species of parallelism occurring here is also known as gradational; it is described by Forbes, "Symmetrical Structure of Scriptures," pp. 5–17.

10. Conclusion of the exhortation, based upon the assurance of ver. 6. **Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord.** This passage resembles, but is not parallel to 1 Peter 5: 6, which indeed is founded upon the same text (Prov. 3: 34), but applies it to submission under affliction. Here James enjoins self-humiliation in the presence of the omniscient and offended Lord. The son of Sirach says: "Those who fear the Lord will humble their souls before him." (2: 17.) **And he shall lift you up**—better, *and he will exalt you.* An allusion to our Lord's words in Matt. 23: 12; Luke 14: 11. Yet this contrast often occurs elsewhere, as Job 5: 11; Isa. 57: 15; Ezek. 21: 26. The promise relates as well to the present hidden, as to the future revealed, glory of the humble Christian. (Huther.) The humble sinner receives the divine favor, and enjoys the happiness arising from the divine fellowship. "The degraded worldling is 'lifted up' to a sphere of elevated thoughts and sublimer pursuits. The mourning penitent is 'lifted up' to the heights of a pure,

11 Speak not evil one of another, brethren. He that speaketh evil of *his* brother, and judgeth his brother, speaketh evil of the law, and judgeth the law: but if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge.
12 There is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy: who art thou that judgest another?

11 Speak not one against another, brethren. He that speaketh against a brother, or judgeth his brother, speaketh against the law, and judgeth the law: but if thou judgest the law, thou art not a doer of the
12 law, but a judge. One *only* is the lawgiver and judge, *even* he who is able to save and to destroy: but who art thou that judgest thy neighbour?

celestial happiness. The slave of Satan is 'lifted up' to those heavenly places in which the King of Glory sits with his servants, and calls them friends." Patterson, "Expos." Compare Matt. 5: 3, 4.

d. James urges (ver. 11–17) a warning against the passions on account of the presumption they inspire in our estimates (ver. 11, 12), and in our projects in secular life. Ver. 13–17.

11. Speak not evil one of another—better, *Speak not against one another.* (So the Syriac.) This admonition is connected with the preceding by the principle that humility before God carries with it lowliness toward his children. The frequent returns of the writer to this subject show that he is dealing with "the ever-besetting sin of his time and people." The sin condemned is calumny, which magnifies the faults and depreciates the virtues and character of others. The unnaturalness of the sin is already indicated by the relationship that Christians bear to each other. They are **brethren,** the children of the same Father, and should take no part in Satan's work of backbiting. (Rev. 12: 10.) **He that speaketh evil of his brother** (the passage must be rendered, *speaketh against his brother*), **and** (*or*) **judgeth his brother, speaketh against the law, and judgeth the law.** Speaking and judging are nearly synonymous; but the speaking presupposes the judgment. Calumny against a brother is evil in its source before it flows out into speech. Calumny is a violation of the law of love, which it condemns as of no authority, or as not founded upon right. It is more particularly an express violation of the law of Christ, who forbids the unkind judgments that prevail in common life. (Matt. 7: 1.) **But if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge.** The calumniator thus leaves the position which becomes him, as a subject of law. The law is promulgated, not that he may judge it, but that it may judge him. He is required to do it. But instead of rendering it a loyal obedience, he makes himself a judge, and promulgates a law by which his neighbor is condemned or absolved—a criminal presumption, as James now proceeds to show. Perhaps it may even be found that the law of God permits what the censorious professor condemns, in which case his condemnation of a brother condemns the law which absolves him, and directly impugns the wisdom and holiness of the Heavenly Lawgiver.

12. There is one lawgiver who is able to save and destroy. Tischendorf adds the words, "and judge," after lawgiver; so also the Syriac [with ℵ A B P, Coptic, Æthiopic Versions.—A. H.] The text is more forcible in the original than in our Version; it may be rendered, *One is the lawgiver and judge, he who is able*, etc. (Rom. 14: 4.) The judgment which discriminates the characters and seals the destinies of men belongs only to him who has given the law. Compare 1 Cor. 4: 3–5. Besides a law is of no avail unless it have its sanctions; hence our sentence is idle, for we cannot execute it. The law has no efficacy unless administered by an Almighty and Eternal Judge (Matt. 10: 28), "who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." **Who art thou that judgest another?** The same rebuke in the same form is administered by Paul in Rom. 14: 4. Instead of *another* read *a neighbor* (so in the Syriac), without the personal pronoun, as Mark 12: 33; Rom. 13: 10. The insignificance of the man is shown by contrasting him with the One Lawgiver and Judge of all. The standards of right among men vary; they know little of the law, and less of the hearts of others, and they are themselves the transgressors of law. When such beings undertake "to judge of motives and character without tangible and most convincing evidence," and on this ground pronounce unfavorable judgments against each other, they arrogate to themselves a wisdom, holiness, and power to which they have not the shadow of a claim. [Davidson's translation of ver. 11 and 12 represents the Greek text, in so far as the definite article is con-

13 Go to now, ye that say, To day or to morrow we will go into such a city, and continue there a year, and buy and sell, and get gain:
14 Whereas ye know not what *shall be* on the morrow. For what *is* your life? It is even a vapour, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away.

13 Go to now, ye that say, to-day or to-morrow we will go into this city, and spend a year there, and
14 trade, and get again: whereas ye know not what shall be on the morrow. What is your life? For ye are a vapour, that appeareth for a little time,

cerned, correctly. "Speak not against one another, brethren. He that speaketh against a brother or judgeth his (literally *the*) brother, speaketh against law and judgeth law; but if thou judgest law, thou art not a doer of law, but a judge. One is the lawgiver and judge, who is able to save and to destroy; but who art thou that judgest thy (literally *the*) *neighbor?*"—A. H.]

13. Now is shown the folly of the carnal desires and secular plans which lead us to forget our dependence upon God. (Ver. 13-17.) **Go to now, ye that say**—better, *Come now*, etc., awakening attention. Here the imperative is used as an interjection as in § 1 a call to *many*, to whom the discourse now turns. The persons whom James addresses are worldlings, whether unconverted members of the Christian community, or aliens who persecuted the brotherhood and blasphemed the name of Christ. (2: 7.) There is no reason to restrict the warning to either of these classes specifically. The writer addresses those who are the votaries of the world, and who will continue in its service notwithstanding his admonition. Hence his severity. Our Lord addressed the same class in the parable of the rich fool. (Luke 12: 16, seq.) The same tone of contemptuous indignation which appears in the parable (ver. 20) is here manifest. **To-day or to-morrow we will go into such a city, and continue there a year, and buy and sell, and get gain.** Some manuscripts have "to-day and to-morrow." This reading, which, however, is probably incorrect, would indicate a two-days' journey. 'Such a city' indicates some definite city to which the traveler proposes to journey. Instead of 'continue there a year,' etc., read, *spend there a year*, etc. The language describes the spirit of "the strangers of the Dispersion" then and now; and also expresses the confidence with which those whom James had in view anticipated the future. The aim of these journeys and business adventures was to **get gain**, which worldly men regard as true success in life. They turn this scene of probation into a market, as once the sacred precincts of the temple were invaded for the sale of oxen and sheep and doves. And the calculations of the future are made without any thought of God, or any apprehension of death. The repetition of the 'ands' well expresses their presumptuous confidence. A large class of Oriental merchants are peddlers, restlessly adventuring from city to city in pursuit of gain. See "Arabian Nights," passim, and Bush's "Illustrations" on James 4: 13. As for the Jews, they were widely distributed over the Roman Empire at the date of our Epistle. Strabo said: "Already a Jewish population has entered every city." The Jews occupied two of the five wards of the great commercial city of Alexandria. They had seven synagogues in Rome. They were in North Africa, and had penetrated to the banks of the Danube and to the remote coasts of Spain and Britain. And everywhere they were busily engaged in trade. Uhlhorn, "Conflict of Christianity," pp. 83, 84. Alzog ("Eccl. Hist.," § 29) indicates the commercial spirit as an active cause of the Jewish Dispersion from the great metropolitan centre of Alexandria, where the Macedonian conqueror had permitted a Jewish colony to settle.

14. This verse is a parenthesis, interrupting for a moment the progress of the discourse. The writers of the epistles employ parentheses to express sometimes a limitation, sometimes a corroboration, sometimes a reason or more precise explanation, as here. (Winer.) **Whereas ye know not what shall be on the morrow.** Carnal security should be disturbed by the uncertainty of the future. (Prov. 27: 1.) "Boast not thyself of to-morrow; for thou knowest not what a day may bring forth." Not careless presumption, but trust in a wise and merciful Providence, relieves the anxieties of life. (Matt. 6: 34.) Instead of 'whereas ye,' read *ye who*, which is the literal translation, and brings out the parenthetic character of the verse. **For what is your life? It is even a vapor** (literally, *for ye are a vapor*) **that appeareth for a little**

15 For that ye *ought* to say, If the Lord will, we shall live, and do this, or that.
16 But now ye rejoice in your boastings: all such rejoicing is evil.
17 Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth *it* not, to him it is sin.

15 and then vanisheth away. [1]For that ye ought to say, If the Lord will, we shall both live, and do
16 this or that. But now ye glory in your vauntings:
17 all such glorying is evil. To him therefore who knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin.

1 Gr. *Instead of your saying.*

time and then vanisheth away. Even life is uncertain. No one can tell whether he will be alive on the morrow. The question means, Of what character is your life, implying its nothingness? Compare 1 Peter 2: 20. "What glory is it?" This suggestion of the vanity of life is confirmed by a familiar figure (Job 7: 7; Ps. 102: 3), to which the connection of the life with the breath gives a striking appropriateness. In cold air the breath becomes visible in the form of vapor which soon disappears. The correct reading, "*Ye are* a vapor," gives peculiar strength to the figure. The warning is specially applicable in the case of the traveler (ver. 13), to whom the vehicle or vessel in which he sets forth may prove his coffin: and the refreshment on the way may work as poison, and prostrate him before he reaches his place of destination.

15. For that ye ought to say—literally, *instead of saying*. The previous verse shows the folly of such expressions as are given in ver. 13. Now James shows how we should speak in regard to the future. **If the Lord will, we shall live, and do this or that**—read, *we shall both live*, etc. Not only the doing, but also the living, as the condition of doing, depends upon the will of God. To the Lord there is nothing uncertain or uncontrollable in the future. And his people may therefore commit themselves trustfully to his guardianship, knowing that the wise, mighty, and loving Will which sways all times and seasons is enlisted in their behalf; and clinging to the divine assurance that all things shall work together for their good. The pious expression of our text became common among Christians. Paul wrote to the Corinthians (1. 4: 19): "I will come to you shortly, if the Lord will." And the formula still retains its place in the familiar speech of Christendom. When it is not uttered in connection with our purposes for the future, and it need not always be (compare 1 Cor. 16: 5), its spirit should always be retained—the sense of dependence upon God for life and for success in all its legitimate enterprises. (Luke 12: 29, 30.)

16. A contrast to the spirit and conduct just described and commended. **But now** indicates how the case really stands. **Ye rejoice in your boastings**—better, *Ye boast in your vainglory*—that is, in the impious and vain arrogance which trusts in the stability of earthly things. This is the sphere or state in which the boasting takes place. The plural form of the noun cannot be given without awkwardness in English. It indicates the various degrees of vainglory, and perhaps also may suggest the various occasions or modes in which it betrays itself. The persons referred to were animated by vainglory, which their presumptuous speech revealed. (Ver. 13; Prov. 27: 1.) **All such rejoicing is evil**—'all such boasting.' Thus the condemnation, already implied in the contrast, finds expression. There is a boasting that is reasonable and good, like that of Paul in Christ Jesus (Phil. 3: 3), and in his cross (Gal. 6: 14); or even in the infirmities which afforded an occasion for the display of God's saving power. (2 Cor. 12: 9.) But the boastings of the vainglorious are unhallowed in their source, are false in their grounds, and are pernicious in their results. Wherefore, let him "that glorieth, glory in the Lord." (2 Cor. 10: 17.)

17. Therefore to him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin. The general law of conscience is here asserted; but in such a way as to emphasize the condemnatory sentence just uttered, and also to indicate that the principle has a special application here. The idea is that where the "becoming" in morals is known, the neglect of it is the actual doing of evil. In such a case positive guilt is incurred. (John 15: 22; Luke 12: 47, 48.) God will hold him gravely responsible who has held his truth captive in unrighteousness. (Rom. 1: 18.) Hence those who know the insecurity of life and the uncertainty of the future, and yet repudiate the facts of their condition, and their dependence upon God, in their far-reaching and presumptuous calculations, act inconsistently and unbecomingly: contradict their own con-

CHAPTER V.

GO to now, *ye* rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon *you*.
2 Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten.

1 Go to now, ye rich, weep and howl for your
2 miseries that are coming upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten.

victions; and sin the more grievously, because they sin against familiar knowledge. But the principle also enforces all the moral lessons upon which the writer has been insisting, and thus prepares his readers for the recapitulation of the subjects discussed, and the concluding of the Epistle. Alford: "Therefore we see in this example the truth of the general axiom," etc.

CONCLUSION.—Duties of the tempted and tried recapitulated and reinforced. 5: 1–20.

1. 1–11. *Swift to hear the revelations of the word; in regard to prosperous wickedness* (ver. 1–6); *and afflicted piety.* Ver. 7–11.

1. Here the conclusion of the Epistle begins, recapitulating and enforcing the duties of the tempted and tried. In the first section (ver. 1-11) the writer exhibits the end of those complications which disturbed the trust of the early believers in the providence of God, and made them slow to receive the assurances of the word. He indicates, therefore, the future of prosperous wickedness (ver. 1-6), and of afflicted piety. (Ver. 7-11.) Yet there is no break in the discourse: having shown that worldly greed is impious and evil, he now considers its present workings and its final result. **Go to now.** This phrase, which is now obsolete, should read *come now.* It is a call to attention, indicating that something important and urgent is to be said. Here it introduces a prophetic denunciation. **Ye rich men.** In the original, we have the nominative with the article, which is allowable in calling and commanding. The persons addressed are persons without the Christian pale. They are not only persons possessed of wealth, but also idolatrous of it, as the connection shows. (Luke 6: 24.) They have secured that which their hearts chiefly value, and which they deem the source of happiness and the great aim of life. And they abuse it. (Ver. 4-6.) **Weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you**—literally, *weep, wailing for your miseries that are coming.* This is not a call to repentance, like 4: 9, but an animated proclamation of judgment. The implication is that the persons addressed would pursue their evil course, and reap the destructive consequences. However prosperous they seem, they must soon weep and wail, for their reverses and ruin are near at hand. And the sorrow should have no solace, because produced by a divine judgment. (Isa. 13: 6.) The miseries are those attendant upon the destruction of Jerusalem (Luke 19: 43, 44), and also upon the final judgment. The two events, of which the former was the symbol and the pledge of the latter, are grouped together by James. The cares and anxieties which wealth brings with it are left out of sight, as unworthy of attention in view of the threatening calamities.

2. The coming judgment is figuratively described. The wealth of the Orientals consisted mainly in coin and clothing. See Acts 20: 33. They trafficked in costly garments, or kept them for ostentation. (Ezra 2: 69; Neh. 7: 70.) Their riches were peculiarly insecure and perishable; they might even be "consumed before the moth." (Job 13: 28; Isa. 50: 9; 51: 8; Matt. 6: 19.) **Riches** is the general term, under which garments and coin (ver. 3) are the specifications. **Are corrupted.** The *decay* of the wealth is a figure to show that it had become worthless. The present tense indicates the certainty of the event predicted, and its near approach. Compare note on 5: 7. Wealth, with the curse of God upon it, is poverty and wretchedness. **Are moth-eaten**—literally, *are become moth-eaten.* In this state the rich stuffs would be well nigh worthless, if not altogether so. Compare Isa. 51: 8. "The moth shall eat them up like a garment, and the worm shall eat them like wool." The age in which the gospel was first preached to the poor was eminently an age of covetousness. The secret of happiness was supposed, even by the religious teachers of the Jewish people, to be discoverable in luxury and pleasure. (Matt. 23: 4; Luke 16: 14.) Hence they adopted any means, however unrighteous, to secure affluence. (Jos. "Ant." XIII. 3: 4, 5.) They needed the stern admonition of James the Just, that while they felicitated themselves in being

3 Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days.

3 Your gold and your silver are rusted; and their rust shall be for a testimony [1] against you, and shall eat your flesh as fire. Ye have laid up your treasure
4 in the last days. Behold, the hire of the labourers

1 Or, *unto*.

rich and increased in goods and having need of nothing, they were on the contrary wretched and destitute. Compare John's warning to the Church of Laodicea. (Rev. 3: 17.) The communism and self-sacrifices of the Pentecostal believers were a generous reaction and protest against the spirit of their people and their times. (Acts 2.)

3. Continuation of the denunciation of the judgments which will befall the rich. **Your gold and silver is cankered**—literally, *is rusted*. The expression is hyperbolical; for gold and silver never rust. James does not refer to the black tarnish which unused silver contracts, or the green discoloration of hoarded gold; but to the loss of value which occurs in other metals through rust. The rusted metals correspond to the motheaten garments: they are worthless. The wealth which you have regarded as a substantial possession, and from which you promise yourselves so much, will be destroyed. **And the rust of them shall be a witness against you**—literally, *to you*. According to our version the dative is that of advantage or disadvantage (*dativus commodi et incommodi*). The rendering *to you* implies that the rust that had gathered upon the unused treasures would testify to the hard-heartedness of their possessors. Compare the words of Horace, "Odes," B. 2, Ode 2. "There is no brightness to silver concealed in the avaricious earth, O Crispus Sallust, a foe to wealth unless *it shines by moderate use*." According to the latter rendering the melancholy ruins of fortune would betoken the destruction of those who foolishly relied upon them. **And shall eat your flesh as it were fire.** The judgment upon the riches extends also to their possessors. The 'flesh'—literally, *the fleshy parts*—is a figure for the wealthy who are designated by that part of the body which they were wont to pamper. This is represented as consumed by the rust, as the fleshy parts of Jezebel were consumed by the dogs. (2 Kings 9: 36.) The keen anguish of the punishment is indicated by the gnawing fire, which tortures while it consumes. The divine judgments are oftentimes described as a devouring fire. (Ps. 21: 9; Isa. 10: 16, 17; 30: 27; Mark 9: 44; Amos 5; 6.) Destruction is usually implied; but the additional idea of torment clearly enters into it (Ezek. 15: 7), as here. Not only the destruction of that which the rich prized above all things will afflict them with a pain as keen as if fire devoured their flesh, but to this will be added remorse for wasted opportunities, for criminal pleasures, and for the guilt incurred in the acquisition of deceitful riches. **Ye have heaped treasure together for (*in*) the last days.** The vanity of the excessive pursuit of wealth by those whom James addressed was shown in the fact that the judgment they had incurred was just about to befall them. The inspired writers did not discriminate, in these warnings, between the last days of the Jewish polity (which were a type and prophecy of the final judgment), and the final judgment itself. They contented themselves in declaring the nearness of the "coming of the Lord" (1 Cor. 15: 51; 1 Thess. 4: 15; 1 John 2: 18); and in warning those to whom they spoke and wrote to be ready for it. This clause, as explained by what precedes, has a kindred meaning to that of Rom. 2: 5. "But, after thy hardness and impenitent heart, treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God." These were the very days when the treasures amassed should bear their testimony, and call down the consuming sentence of God upon their guilty possessors. The covetous, who were laying up treasure even by fraud and oppression (ver. 4-6), ought rather to be making ready for the coming Judge. (Ver. 8; Luke 17: 26-30.) See note on 5: 7.

NOTE.—In ver. 3, 5, and 6, we have not changed the rendering in our Common Version of the aorist by the perfect, believing that an endeavor to preserve the precise character of the original in these instances would give an air of stiffness to the translation.

4. The ground of the judgment was the unrighteousness exercised in the acquisition and use of riches. (Ver. 4-6.) Here unrighteous-

4 Behold, the hire of the labourers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth.
5 Ye have lived in pleasure on the earth, and been wanton; ye have nourished your hearts, as in a day of slaughter.

who mowed your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth out: and the cries of them that reaped have entered into the ears of the Lord of
5 Sabaoth. Ye have lived delicately on the earth, and taken your pleasure; ye have nourished your hearts
6 in a day of slaughter. Ye have condemned, ye

ness toward laborers is specified. An improved translation of the present verse would be: "*Behold the hire of the laborers who reaped your fields, which is fraudulently kept back by you, crieth out; and the cries of those that reaped have entered into the ears of the Lord of Hosts.*" **Behold, the hire of the labourers who have reaped your fields.** 'Behold,' indicates that something worthy of earnest attention is about to be spoken. The mode in which the wealth had been accumulated was iniquitous. The money due to the laborers who had gathered harvests for the wealthy was withheld—Syriac "wrongfully retained"—a wrong which the law did not tolerate even for a single night. (Lev. 19: 13.) Against such evil doers a woe was denounced (Jer. 22: 13), and a swift judgment predicted. Mal. 3: 5; compare Job 31: 38, 39. **Crieth out**—demanding vengeance as with a loud clamor. (Gen. 4: 10; Exod. 2: 23.) To condemn to hunger those whose labors supply us with bread is a crime that cries to heaven. For they are more than hirelings: they are God's wards. The bounteous Giver of the harvest assigns a due portion thereof to those who gather it. To wrong even the hireling of the fields is to break an ordinance of heaven. (Ps. 126: 5, 6.) In this age poverty was regarded as a crime and pity for the necessitous as a weakness. (Virgil, "Geor." ii. 499.) But Christianity came forth from the carpenter's shop at Nazareth, to dignify honest and useful labor, and to assert the right of the poor man to enjoy the fruits of his toil and satisfy the needs of his nature. A large number of the early Christians supported themselves by their daily labor. (1 Thess. 4: 11.) **And the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth** (*hosts*). The almightiness of God to redress and avenge is indicated by the title "Lord of the (angelic) hosts." Compare Rev. 4: 8 with Isa. 6: 3. The Ruler of the armies of heaven has sovereign power over all the multitudes of earth among whom he represses the strong and saves the weak. (Rom. 9: 29.) The hosts he gloriously rules are the stars and the angels. Ps. 24: 10; compare Deut. 4: 19; 1 Kings 22: 19. And he hears the cry of the oppressed on earth, who appeal to him for deliverance. (Gen. 18: 21; 19: 13; Exod. 2: 23; 3: 9; 2 Sam. 22: 7; s. 18: 6; Isa. 5: 9.) James uses the Hebrew title of the supreme King of the Universe, as he is writing to Jews among whom this title was familiar; it occurs not less than twenty-three times in Malachi.

5. The rich were also unrighteous in the use they made of their riches, which they devoted not to the relief of the weary and poor laborers, but to the gratification of their own lusts. While those by whom their wealth was created suffered, they lived in voluptuousness and debauchery. **Ye have lived in pleasure on the earth, and been wanton**—Syriac, "revelled." Ye have lived in voluptuousness and in luxury. The picture of such a life had already been drawn by our Lord in the parable of the rich man. (Luke 16: 19.) They sought for nothing higher than earthly delights, unmindful of that wrath which was about to be "revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men." (Rom. 1: 18.) The form of the verb (the gnomic aorist) indicates that this was the habit and character of their lives. **Ye have nourished your hearts, as in a day of slaughter**—better, *ye have pampered your hearts in a day of slaughter.* 'Your hearts' implies more than *yourselves.* Agreeably to the physiological views of antiquity, the heart and the stomach were closely connected; hence the idea of the pleasures of eating is here suggested. Compare Acts 14: 17. (Winer.) 'In a day of slaughter' is not equivalent to *for a day of slaughter*, as some suppose, but is parallel to "in the last days." Ver. 3. See Jer. 12: 3; 25: 34. While they were carelessly and greedily pampering their appetites and passions, the day of their judgment had already dawned. They were like oxen feasting on a day of butchery; like Belshazzar revelling, while an armed and bloodthirsty foe was at his palace gates. (Luke 21: 34.)

6 Ye have condemned *and* killed the just; *and* he doth not resist you.
7 Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold, the husbandmen waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and latter rain.

have killed the righteous *one;* he doth not resist you.
7 Be patient therefore, brethren, until the [1]coming of the Lord. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, being patient over it, until [2]it receive the early and latter rain.

1 Gr. *presence*.....2 Or, *he*.

6. Ye have condemned and killed the just, and he doth not resist you. Another sin of the rich was that they shamefully perverted the influence they had, in oppressing and even murdering the righteous. The original is more spirited than our rendering. It is: *Ye have condemned, ye have killed the just man; he doth not resist you.* The rich are charged with doing what they caused the judges and executioners to do, as well as with the guilt of those iniquitous sentences which they themselves pronounced and inflicted. The chief priests and elders persuaded the multitude to reject the Lord. (Matt. 27: 20.) And the same "rulers" (Acts 3: 17) and "princes" (1 Cor. 2: 8) who were guilty of the blood of the Lord were also foremost in the persecutions of his people. 'The just' (*man*) expresses the whole class, just as 'the poor' (*man*) does in 2: 6. The case of Jesus is not specifically referred to, because James is charging the wealthy and powerful with a crime which they were accustomed to commit. A parallel to this passage is found in Wisdom of Solomon 2: 10–20. It is an interesting circumstance that James himself was commonly known as "the Just," even among the Jews. Hegesippus thus describes his martyrdom: "The Scribes and Pharisees threw down the Just from the pinnacle of the temple, and said, 'Let us stone James the Just!' and they began to stone him; for he had not been killed by the fall, but turning round, knelt and said: 'I beseech thee, Lord God and Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' But while they were thus stoning him, one of the fullers took the club with which he used to press the clothes and struck the head of the Just. Thus he suffered martyrdom." The legend, to which indeed little importance is to be given, serves nevertheless to illustrate the meaning of our text. 'He doth not resist you.' This circumstance emphasizes the unrighteousness and criminality of the rich, who are unmoved by the patient sufferings of their innocent victims. It also implies that, being allowed full scope of action here, they might the more certainly expect to be called to account for their conduct hereafter. (Amos 2: 6, 7; 5: 12; 8: 4.) That a menace is involved in the expression appears from what immediately follows. The meekness of the just is "the dead calm before the earthquake."

7. Suffering believers are cheered, and are exhorted to patient endurance. (Ver. 7-11.) **Be patient therefore, brethren.** The 'brethren' are contrasted with the rich and powerful, and are assigned to the class of the just (ver. 6) whom these persecute. And they must vindicate their claim to this high association by exhibiting the long suffering which is a distinguishing characteristic of the just, when under persecution for righteousness' sake. **Unto** (*until*) **the coming of the Lord.** The return of Christ is pointed to as a day of retribution, when the good and the evil would, each of them, experience the destiny he had been preparing for. After Christ's coming, the just, now suffering on earth, would become blessed spirits in the better world. Like their Master, they would exchange the cross for the crown. The early Christians had no knowledge of the time of this coming, which yet they supposed to be nigh; and they could not distinguish between his coming to destroy Jerusalem, and his coming to judge the world. The former was the foreshadowing and the assurance of the latter. **Behold the husbandman waiteth,** etc. Instead of **and hath long patience for it,** read *being patient over it;* and instead of **until he receive,** read *until it receive.* It is the opinion of some interpreters that a drought prevailed during the very year when this Epistle was written. Compare Acts 11: 28. This circumstance would give special weight and aptness to the illustration. The same illustration occurs in Eccles. 6: 19. The husbandman after sowing is not hopeless or impatient, because some time must elapse before the harvest appears to reward his toil. And, like him, the Christian must keep himself in patience until the precious fruit of his toils for

God is matured and reaped. There were two heavy rainfalls in Palestine—one in autumn, the other in spring (Deut. 11: 14; Jer. 5: 24; Joel 2: 23), the rainy season extending from October until March. When these duly appeared, a good harvest might reasonably be expected. The "early rain" fell in the month of October; the "latter," in the month of March. By the first the soil was softened for husbandry; by the second, the swelling grain was fed.

NOTE.—'The coming of the Lord' specifically denotes the visible return of the Lord Jesus Christ from heaven to raise the dead, to hold the final judgment, and to establish the kingdom of God solemnly and gloriously. (2 Thess. 1: 6, 7.) In general it indicates any particular interposition for the punishment of Messiah's enemies, or for the discipline or deliverance of his people. (Phil. 4: 5; Heb. 10: 25.) Hence the judgments about to befall the churches of Asia Minor were described as the personal visitations of Christ. (Rev. 2: 5, 16.) "*I will come* quickly, and take away thy candlestick." (Rev. 2: 5.) "*I will come* on thee quickly." It is clear enough that the early Christians could not distinguish between such occasional visitations of the Heavenly King and his final coming. Hence both were confounded in the question of the disciples. (Matt. 24: 3.) "Tell us when shall these things [the calamities of Jerusalem] be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" Nor have we any reason to suppose that the disciples were afterwards apprised of the time fixed either for Christ's return to destroy the Jewish State, or to judge the world.

The Lord indeed taught his disciples that the two events were not simultaneous. In the account given by Matthew, we have the answer to the questions of the disciples in regard to both events. Mark and Luke give Christ's explanation of but one—the destruction of Jerusalem, which was to be preceded by signs and portents; the other should come like a thief in the night. See my article on "The Coming of Christ," in Ford's "Repository," March, 1879. Paul also distinguished between the Comings. He warned the Philippians that "the Lord was at hand." (Phil. 4: 5.) But he urged the Thessalonians not to be disturbed by the impression that the day of Christ was at hand, declaring that the times were not yet ripe for our Lord's coming. These texts would be contradictory, unless different comings had been intended. All the disciples looked for the Lord's appearing (Col. 3: 4), yet Peter also, like Paul, warned his readers against expecting the speedy advent of Christ, reminding them that "one day with the Lord is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." (2 Peter 3: 8, 9.)

How, then, shall we explain those passages which imply that the day of Christ might at any moment break upon the world? In three respects the coming of Christ was near. 1. Christ comes at the day of death, when the destiny is forever decided. (2 Cor. 5: 8.) Those who are "absent from the body" are "*present with the Lord.*" This day is near to every one. 2. The overthrow of the Jewish polity was at hand when the epistles were written. This event was aptly described as a day of divine visitation; for it vindicated the honor of Christ, rolled away the reproach of his death, arrested the persecutions of his people, and gave them new proofs of his guardian care; for, warned by his prophecy (Matt. 24: 15-18.), they had already betaken themselves to a safe retreat in Pella, beyond Jordan, when their enemies were falling beneath the Roman sword. 3. The general judgment was near as computed by the Dispensations of the eternal God (2 Peter 3: 8, 9), who measures the ages by his own existence, and to whom our ages are "as yesterday," and "as a watch in the night." (Ps. 90: 4.) It must also be observed that the prophets, like all speakers passionately assured of the future, use the figure of promptness or nearness to indicate certainty. Lowth, in his "Lectures on Hebrew Poetry" (§ 15, p. 162, Lond. Ed., 1835), calls attention to the frequency with which the prophets use the present tense to indicate what will certainly occur in the future, as in the prophetic narrative of Sennacherib's invasion of Palestine. Isa. 10: 28–32. Compare the burden of Babylon, Isa. 13: 6: "The day of the Lord is at hand." Also the punishment of Israel, Ezek. 7: 6: "The end is come," etc. So with the primeval curse, which was not immediately inflicted, nor is yet exhausted, Gen. 2: 17: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." And so with the gospel promise of deliverance, John 5: 25: "The

8 Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh.
9 Grudge not one against another, brethren, lest ye be condemned: behold, the judge standeth before the door.

8 Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts: for the
9 [1]coming of the Lord is at hand. Murmur not, brethren, one against another, that ye be not judged: behold, the judge standeth before the
10 doors. Take, brethren, for an example of suffer-

1 Gr., *presence.*

hour is coming, *and now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." In this way the certainty of the event was indicated, and the attention of men was fixed upon the prophecy. The same figure, the hypotyposis, is familiar in secular poetry and oratory.

8. The appeal, with the motive for heeding it, is renewed. Patience is encouraged by the nearness of the Lord's coming. (1 Peter 4: 7; Rom. 13: 11.) Storr's "Diss. on Kingdom of Heaven," § 9. **Be ye also patient.** 'Also' refers to the husbandman, who is an example in patience to the believer. **Stablish** (or *strengthen*) **your hearts** by anticipating the Advent of Christ, when the injustice and violence of men will be redressed. Patience is the attribute—not, as is commonly supposed, of the weak, but of the strong (1 Thess. 3: 13, 1 Peter 5: 10); and Christian hope is the secret of Christian strength. Plumptre: "The promise of the Second Advent has been to believers in Christ what the promise of the First Advent was to Abraham and the patriarchs. They saw the far-off fulfillment, knowing not the times and the seasons, and it made them feel that they were 'pilgrims and strangers' (Heb. 11: 13), and so purified and strengthened them." And, so far as the case of those to whom James wrote was concerned, the coming of the Lord to redeem them from the persecutions inflicted upon them by a proud and dominant Judaism, was near at hand; although, as the event proved, the time of the general and final retribution was yet far distant. The early disciples were assured of the certainty of the Lord's coming, and were taught that it might be expected at any time. (2 Thess. 1: 4-8.) Thus they were encouraged patiently to wait for it. But they were also warned against undue excitement, or any presumption in regard to it. (2 Thess. 2: 1-4), and were admonished that God's appointed time might embrace centuries in its sweep. (2 Peter 3: 8.) Compare Angus. "Christ our Life," 323-333.

NOTE.—The frequent appeals enjoining patience and hope are thought by Bensen and Stanley to indicate the year 42 as the date of the Epistle, a period when a train of calamities befell that vast Jewish population dwelling upon the plains of Babylonia (Stanley, "Essays and Sermons," p. 294), when, in the expressive language of Milman ("Hist. Jews," 2: 185): "The skirts of that tremendous tempest, which was slowly gathering over the native country and metropolis of the devoted people, first broke, and discharged their heavy clouds of ruin and desolation, one by one, over each of their remoter settlements."

9. Another admonition founded on the approach of the Judgment. **Judge not one against another**—that is, *Murmur not.* Those who suffer are wont to complain, and easily become fretful and captious toward their nearest and most loved associates. They groan because they suffer more than others who are, they think, more faulty than themselves, or because they do not receive from others due attention and sympathy. They easily imagine themselves the unhappy victims of inhumanity or injustice. And, as our Epistle shows, such complaints were not always without foundation. **Lest ye be condemned.** For if the complaint were groundless, the false judgment would be criminal; if it were just, the complainant would have usurped the prerogatives of the coming Judge—an office most unsuitable for a sinful man, who is soon to stand his own trial before the Searcher of hearts. Another thought is suggested by the use of the word **brethren.** Dinter: "Even he who has injured still remains thy brother, thy Father's son, the purchase of thy Redeemer—one to whom thou must wish good rather than evil." **Behold the judge standeth before the door**—that is, *at the door.* (Literally, *before the doors.*) This expression indicates the nearness of the judge, who might present himself at any moment. (Matt. 24: 33; Mark 13: 29.) *He* will best know and judge what awards to impart and to inflict. And the rule of his judgment will condemn the uncharitable (Matt. 7: 1), to whom he will assign the measure which they have meted out to others.

[In the *textus receptus* there is no article

10 Take, my brethren, the prophets, who have spoken in the name of the Lord, for an example of suffering affliction, and of patience.
11 Behold, we count them happy which endure. Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord; that the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy.

ing and of patience, the prophets who spake in the
11 name of the Lord. Behold, we call them blessed who endured: ye have heard of the [1]patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord, how that the Lord is full of pity, and merciful.

1 Or, *endurance.*

before the word 'judge,' but the authors of our Common Version inserted one, because the context leaves no room for doubt that James refers to the Supreme Judge. And a careful examination of the best MSS. shows that they have the article. This is true of ℵ A B K L P, while no important uncial sustains the *textus receptus* in omitting the article. Let the work of textual criticism be encouraged, till the sources of knowledge have all been examined.—A. H.]

10. Take, my brethren, the prophets who have spoken, etc. The rendering is improved by omitting 'my,' which is not expressed in the original, and by changing 'have spoken' into *spoke*. **For an example of suffering affliction, and of patience**—better, *an example of affliction, and of patience*. 'An example' to cheer the heart, and an example to influence the conduct of suffering believers, was afforded by the history of the prophets of earlier times. (Matt. 5: 12.) The favor they had with God, and the dignity of the office they bore, did not exempt them from suffering; nor did their afflictions, however unmerited and extreme, induce them to surrender their trust in God, or renounce their sacred, but arduous mission. They relied on the grace of him who sent them, and they expected a final reward at his hands. 'The prophets who spoke in the name of the Lord,' who uttered their warnings, promises, and appeals by divine authority. (Jer. 20: 9; 44: 16; Dan. 9: 6.) They protested against the worship of idols, and against the prevalent vices of their people, as transgressions of the law of God, and, on this account, they were all of them persecuted, and some of them killed. (Matt. 23: 29, 30; Luke 13: 33, 34.) There were also prophets in the Christian churches (1 Cor. 12: 10; Eph. 2: 20; Rev. 22: 9), who were exposed to similar trials; but James could not have referred to these, inasmuch as his Epistle was written to them, as well as to other believers, all of whom he sought to inspire by the recollections of the heroic days of old. (Heb. 11: 35-38.) Yet there was a close relationship between the Old and the New Testament prophets; they both were instructed in the divine mysteries and purposes of grace, and communicated them to others. Hence, in the case of the Old Testament prophets, says Cremer (p. 569): "Their preaching was a predicting, *a foretelling of the salvation yet to be accomplished:* while, in the case of the New Testament prophets, it was *a publication of the salvation already accomplished.*" Hence, in Eph. 3: 5; 2: 20, they are named side by side with apostles as the foundation of the Church. They were for the Church what the seers of old were for Israel, and needed the encouragement of their memorable example.

11. Nor was the case of the prophets peculiar in this respect. The entire class of triumphant sufferers to which they belonged is now honored and blest. (Matt. 24: 13.) **Behold, we count them happy which endure**—read, *who have endured*. We assure ourselves that God has not left the pious sufferers of the past unrewarded. (Matt. 5: 12.) Among these, *Job* (to whose history this is the only New Testament reference) was conspicuous. This patriarch, whom James recognizes as a real character, was a memorable example of patient endurance under troubles and unmerited reproaches. The story of Job was recited in the synagogue reading, and must have been generally known. It is referred to in Ezek. 14: 14-20. Paul quotes from the book (5: 13) in 1 Cor. 3: 19. What the Jews knew of their law and history was chiefly derived from oral instruction; hence, *hearing* is more frequently mentioned than reading. This was the case even with the rich and noble. (1 Kings 4: 3; 2 Kings 12: 11; Isa. 29: 18; Jer. 36: 4; Rev. 1: 3.) **And have seen the end of the Lord; that the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy.** According to Tischendorf the reading should be: "Behold also the end of the Lord"—the happy result which the Lord brought forth from the affliction (genitive of cause); and see from this history 'that the Lord is very pitiful and

12 But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by

12 But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by the heaven, nor by the earth, nor by any

of tender mercy.' No finer example could James present (save that of the First of Sufferers) than that of the patriarch whose story exhibits the extremes of prosperous integrity, terrible sufferings, persistent endurance, glorious deliverance, and eminent blessedness—a portentous yet transient thunder-cloud which passes away with a rainbow of peace and promise on its breast. The sufferings of his servant brought out into brighter relief the tender compassions of God. Believers might be assured from this history that God would not lay upon them more than they were able to bear, nor let them suffer longer than was necessary and beneficial to them.

Upon the history of this patriarch and the book that records it, Herder ("Hist. Heb. Poetry," Dial. 5, *ad finem*) eloquently remarks: "If he, the patient sufferer, was here the recorder of his own afflictions and triumphs, of his own wisdom, first victorious in conflict and then humbled in the dust, how blest has been his trials, how richly rewarded his pains! In a book full of imperishable thoughts, he still lives, gives utterance to the sorrows of his heart, and extends his triumph over centuries and continents. Not only, according to his wish, did he die in his nest, but a phœnix has sprung forth from his ashes, and from that odorous nest is diffused an incense which gives, and will forever give, reviving energy to the faint and strength to the powerless. He has drawn down the heavens to the earth, encamped their host invisibly around the bed of languishing, and made the afflictions of the sufferer a spectacle to angels; yea, has taught that God looks with watchful eye upon his creatures, and exposes them to the trial of their integrity for the maintenance of his own truth and the promotion of his own glory." (5: 11.)

A brilliant literary genius of England has confounded heaven itself with such a posthumous influence, regarding it as her noblest aim to live:

> In thoughts sublime that pierce the world like stars,
> And with their mild persistence urge men's search
> To vaster issues. This is life to come,
> Which martyred men have made more glorious
> For us who strive to follow. May I reach
> That purest heaven, be to other souls
> The cup of strength in some great agony,
> Enkindle generous ardor, feed pure love,
> Beget the smiles that have no cruelty,
> Be the sweet presence of a good diffused,
> And in diffusion ever more intense,—
> So shall I join the choir invisible
> Whose music is the gladness of the world.
>
> —GEORGE ELIOT.

All these high aspirations religion encourages, but it gives them a scope and a preciousness of which the gifted sceptic had no knowledge: it crowns them with the revelation of a personal God, and the assurance of a personal immortality.

2. 5: 12-18. *Slowness to speak.* Religious use of the tongue, not in swearing (ver. 12); but in prayer and song (ver. 13-18); in seasonable worship (ver. 13); intercessory worship (ver. 14-16); trustful worship. Ver. 16-18.

12. As the previous verses of this chapter (1-11) recapitulated and enforced the duties of tried believers, as demanded by reverence for the divine word (they must be swift to hear), James now recalls the second theme of the Epistle (slow to speak), giving warnings and directions in regard to the pious use of the tongue. (Ver. 12-18.) The tongue, he observes, in the first place, must not be employed in swearing. (Ver. 12.) There must be no irreverence in its most sacred act, the utterance of the name of God in an appeal to his throne. **Above all things, my brethren, swear not.** This warning is to be laid to heart as the most important of all. It reproduces our Lord's injunction. (Matt. 5: 33-37.) That solemn judicial oaths are not prohibited to Christians is evident from our Lord's answer to Caiaphas, when put on oath in the usual form (Matt. 26: 63, 64); and from Paul's use, in his inspired writings, of expressions which are of the nature of an oath. (Rom. 1: 9; 2 Cor. 1: 23; Gal. 1: 20; Phil. 1: 8.) It is also evident from the fact that swearing in the name of God was not only permitted under the Old Dispensation (Deut. 6: 13; 10: 20; Ps. 63: 11), but was even predicted by the prophets as a sign of the future conversion of the world to God. (Isa. 65: 16; Jer. 12: 16; 23: 7, 8.) It is the careless and the familiar use of oaths which James condemns. A careless oath is criminal, because every oath involves an appeal to God. (Matt. 23: 16-22.)

any other oath: but let your yea be yea; and *your* nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation.
13 Is any among you afflicted? let him pray. Is any merry? let him sing psalms.

other oath: but [1]let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay; that ye fall not under judgment.
13 Is any among you suffering? let him pray. Is
14 any cheerful? let him sing praise. Is any among

1 Or, *let yours be the yea, yea, and the nay, nay.* Compare Matt. 5: 37.

A habitual oath is criminal, because it depreciates the simple word, and shows an indifference to truth, "which stands in striking contrast with the earnestness of the Christian Spirit." Clement of Alexandria ("Strom." vii. 8) proudly remarks that "it is indignity for a Christian to be put upon his oath." The yes or no of a true man always suffices. The forms of swearing here mentioned were those common among the Jews. **Lest ye fall into condemnation.** This shows the importance of the prohibition. The frivolous swearer will incur the judgment of the Great Day. Profane expletives were common in our Lord's day, and then, as now, they were expressions of impiety toward God, and the resort of fraud and falsehood toward men. (Matt. 23: 16-22.) And the irreverence for God, thus displayed and encouraged, strikes at the foundation of religion and morality. Hence, James' emphatic 'above all.'

13. Yet while God's name should not be abused by trivial oaths, every occasion of life should recall it. The afflicted should pour out their hearts to him in prayer, the joyful in sacred song. These are the proper modes of appeal to God. **Is any among you afflicted? Let him pray.** The affliction may be either of the mind or of the body. The pain is softened, and the murmur is hushed, as the suffering Christian reminds himself of the wisdom, power, and love of God, and submits himself trustfully to the divine providence. Thus he receives guidance and help, and is strengthened for the courageous endurance of his sufferings. **Is any merry** (*cheerful*)? **Let him sing psalms**—literally, *let him play*—that is, *upon the harp.* As such music (the psalm) was the accompaniment of sacred song, it came to indicate the words themselves. The "psalm," as distinguished from the hymn and the spiritual song, required the use of an instrument of music. See Trench on New Testament Synonyms, Part II., § 28. The "hymn" was a song of praise. The "spiritual song" was a lyrical expression of Christian experience. All these varieties were familiar to Christian antiquity, as we learn from Col. 3: 16 (consult Lightfoot on the passage), and Eph. 5: 19. We may suppose James to have embraced them all in his injunction. Prosperity and happiness cease to be seductive when they are traced to their Author, and welcomed as the gift of a loving Father. Gratitude to God will lead to a wise use of fortune. The character of worship must correspond with the sad or the cheerful spirit of the worshiper. Hence the prayer must be genuine and true. (John 4: 23, 24.) In regard to the worship by music, Plumptre remarks: "It is perhaps specially characteristic of James that he contemplates what we may call the individual use of such music, as well as the congregational, as a help to the spiritual life. We are reminded of two memorable instances of this employment in the lives of George Herbert and Milton. Compare also Hooker's grand words on the power of Psalmody and Music. 'Eccl. Polity,' V. 38." Pliny, in his letter to Trajan (Ep. 9: 7), speaks of the hymns which the early Christians used to sing among themselves to Jesus Christ as God. None of these hymns survive; yet some of the passages in the epistles, which are full of lyric rapture, may give some idea of what they were. Such is the hymn to Christian love in 1 Cor. 13, and the pæan of Christian assurance in Rom. 8: 31-39. See also 1 Tim. 3: 16, which rings like a battle-song. Compare Pressensé, "Apost. Era," p. 372, s. In the age to which the gospel was given, Christian life spontaneously expressed itself in song. (Acts 16: 25.) One of the most laudable objects of the systems of modern education is the recovery of this last accomplishment which, after having been made an art too fine for popular use in the last century, has been well nigh supplanted by instrumental music in this. Personal enjoyment of singing, which is all that James here specifies, would lead to congregational singing. Mr. Ellerton sketches the liturgical use of hymns in Smith's "Dict. Antiq.," p. 801, § 99.

14. Another kind of pious appeal to God is indicated—intercessory prayer in behalf of

14 Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord:
15 And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and

you sick? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, [1] anointing him with
15 oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord

1 Or, *having anointed.*

those afflicted by sickness. (Ver. 14-16.) **Is any sick among you?** The language is general, seeming to indicate any case of sickness (Matt. 10: 8; Luke 4: 40); but the connection would seem to imply that the case intended was that of one who, in addition to his bodily ailment, was also suffering spiritually, and was shaken in faith. For, in addition to the remedy customarily used for the relief of pain (Mark 6: 13; Luke 10: 34), prayer was also to be employed for the cure and the forgiveness of the patient. (Ver. 15.) **Let him call for the elders of the church.** These were the presiding officers of the church (the name having been transferred from the synagogue) who were more than one in number, because anciently there seems to have been but one church in a city or community, with several preaching places, instead of separate churches as now. (Acts 20: 17.) They were in no respect different from bishops, their Greek title (as Jerome on Titus 1: 7 admits). Hence the names of elders and bishops are interchanged (Acts 20: 17, 28; Titus 1: 5, 7), and so also are the offices. (1 Peter 5: 1, 2.) Besides the extraordinary office of the apostle (an eye witness of the resurrection, Acts 1: 22), there were but two ecclesiastical officers, that of the bishop and that of the deacon. (Phil. 1: 1; 1 Tim. 3: 1, 8.) From the diverse origin and associations of these titles, the name *bishop* marked the duty, that of *elder* the dignity of the same office. In the case of affliction here indicated these officers were to be called in. **And let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord.** The oil was not to be used to produce any magical effect; for it was, as we observed above, the common means of healing. Celsus prescribed rubbing with olive oil as a remedy for fever. Herod used oil baths. To its use in healing an allusion is made by the prophet Isaiah. (1: 6.) Yet in connection with its use, as doubtless in the case of the disciples (Mark 6: 13), a new efficacy was communicated to the friendly ministry by the prayer of faith. (Ver. 15.) The elders prayed, as the organs of the Church, and in dependence upon the blessing of the Lord, in whose name the act was done. On the supposition that the gifts of healing (1 Cor. 12: 9), with other miraculous powers of the early Church, have ceased, the Greek Church observes the injunction of James by the united prayer of the elders for the cure of the sick, the natural remedies being also used —a practice warranted by the inspired injunction. The Roman Catholic Church has adopted, instead, an ordinance of its own invention called the sacrament of extreme unction, which is administered not as here to those who may hope for recovery, but only to dying persons, and which is supposed to impart to them spiritual healing This sacrament is entirely unwarranted by James' teachings, which now are followed when we use the appropriate means of healing, and pray and trust that God will make them effectual, and when, with still stronger faith, we invoke spiritual blessings upon the sufferer, whom Satan hath bound. (Luke 13: 16.) How strangely the simple direction has been abused! Oil when blessed by a bishop is regarded by Romanists as having a miraculous efficacy, as imparting spiritual blessings, and even investing lifeless objects with sanctity. Hence it becomes an object of superstitious veneration. "The prayers" says Fleury, "may in case of necessity be omitted, and the unction alone used." Edgar has an instructive chapter upon this subject (chap. 15) in his "Variations of Popery." Mr. Scudamore gives a learned and dry account of sacerdotal and sacramental follies in oil, in Smith's "Dict. Chris. Antiq.," pp. 2000.

15. Such intercessory prayer is encouraged by the salutary result that may be expected from it. **And the prayer of faith shall (*will*) save the sick**—Syriac, "will heal him who is sick." The prayer of faith (genitive of the subject) is the prayer which faith offers. The elders who offer the prayer must have confidence in its acceptance. (John 14: 13, 14.) Yet the faith of the sick man who has sent for them, and prays with them, is also implied. Compare Matt. 9: 22; Luke 7: 50; 8: 48, and so many other cases where our Lord in healing had regard to the faith of the

the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him.
16 Confess *your* faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.
17 Elias was a man subject to like passions as we are,

shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins,
16 it shall be forgiven him. Confess therefore your sins one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The supplication of a righteous
17 man availeth much in its working. Elijah was a man of like [1] passions with us, and he prayed [2] fer-

1 Or, *nature*.....2 Gr. *with prayer*.

sufferer. In this case, not the oil, but the prayer is represented as instrumental in procuring the desired blessing. On account of this, the Lord Jesus (Acts 9:34) will raise the sick man from his bed of languishing, **And if he have committed sins, they (*it*) shall be forgiven him.** *Even if* the sickness should have been caused by the man's sins (compare 1 Cor. 11:30), the case would not be desperate. In response to the prayer of faith, the sins themselves should be forgiven, of which the cessation of the sickness would be the evidence. The absoluteness of the promise diplays the coloring of the age of miracles (1 Cor. 12:9), yet it must not be confined to that age; wherever a corresponding faith is exercised, a corresponding result will occur. See this subject as unfolded in Dr. Mell on "Prayer." The ordinary petition of faith has the humble limitation, "not as I will, but as thou wilt." (Matt. 26:39.) Yet such a faith, while it does not demand the healing of the body, may not the less confidently assure itself of the forgiveness of the contrite, believing soul. Plumptre: "It is noticeable that the remission of sins thus promised is dependent not on the utterance of the quasi-judicial formula of the *absolvo te* (that was not used indeed at all until the thirteenth century) by an individual priest, but on the prayers of the elders as representing the Church. Compare John 20:23, where also the promise is in the plural, "Whosesoever sins *ye* remit." Under a spiritual dispensation a merely verbal, official forgiveness has no value; evil is not conquered except by faith, which, deriving strength from a higher sphere, struggles with it, casts it away, and rises beyond it "into magnificence of rest." See Ruskin's illustration of this principle in art, "Modern Painters," p. 300.

16. The general conditions upon which such grace is imparted are mutual confessions and prayer, to which accordingly believers are exhorted. **Confess your faults (*transgressions*) one to another.** According to the Vatican manuscript, *Confess therefore*, etc. The exhortation implies that the sick man confessed his transgressions to the elders, when they prayed for him, acknowledging his sins against God and his fellow-men; and it further requires that such confessions should be made not only by the private members of the church to the elders, but by believers to each other. These confessions might be in public, as those mentioned in Matt. 3:6; Acts 19:18, 19, or such as are made in the class meetings of Methodists; or they might be in private intercourse. (1 John 1:9.) The confession of wrong doing and of desert of punishment, as it is the first step of reformation, is therefore a condition of forgiveness. And, like the confessions, the mutual prayers might also be in public or private. The intercessions of believers for each other have as large a scope and as rich a promise as the intercessions of the elders for the sick. Here, however, without excluding necessarily its proper meaning, the *healing* is used in a figurative sense, as in Heb. 12:13; 1 Peter 2:24, having special reference to the spiritual maladies, of which the "transgressions" were the symptoms. **The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much.** It is difficult to decide upon the precise meaning of the participle here translated by the two words *effectual fervent*. It signifies an inworking prayer—a prayer by which the worshiper is, as it were, *possessed* (Rom. 8:26), and which is therefore fervent and strenuous, and will take no denial. Compare Gal. 2:8; Eph. 3:20. That such desires for the welfare of others, or for the prosperity of the cause of Christ, will be accompanied by active exertions, follows as a matter of course. The prayers must be those of a 'righteous man'—that is, a man whose will is in conformity with the will of God.

17. An incident in the history of the prophet Elijah shows the power of such prayer. (Ver. 17, 18.) **Elias was a man, subject to like passions as we are.** Instead of 'subject to,' etc., read *of like passions with us*. Thus the great prophet is described by James, in order that

and he prayed earnestly that it might not rain: and it rained not on the earth by the space of three years and six months.
18 And he prayed again, and the heaven gave rain, and the earth brought forth her fruit.
19 Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him;

vently that it might not rain; and it rained not on
18 the earth for three years and six months. And he prayed again; and the heaven gave rain, and the earth brought forth her fruit.
19 My brethren, if any among you do err from the
20 truth, and one convert him; [1] let him know, that he

1 Some ancient authorities read *know ye.*

his readers might be persuaded to follow his example. He was not elevated above the ordinary conditions of our humanity, but was a man of like constitution and nature with ourselves. Compare Acts 14: 15, having the same feelings and passions as we. Syriac: "Of sensations like us." **And he prayed earnestly that it might not rain.** This prayer of Elijah is not mentioned in the ancient record. (1 Kings 17: 18.) Yet the statement of James suffices; and indeed it may be concluded that Elijah was a man of prayer, not only on account of his steadfast faith (1 Kings 17: 1), but from the incidental account of his posture as a worshiper on the summit of Carmel. (1 Kings 18: 42.) There is an allusion to this history in Rev. 11· 6, 12. **And it rained not on the earth by the space of three years and six months.** Luke 4: 25 makes the same statement as to the duration of the drought. This is not contradicted by the account of the termination of the drought in the third year, if we suppose that "the third year" marks the length of Elijah's residence at Zarephath, which, allowing a year for his seclusion at the Brook Cherith (1 Kings 17: 2-8), would be the fourth year of the famine. 'The earth' may signify only the chastised *land* of Palestine. Compare Luke 4: 25; 21: 23; Rom. 9· 28. A similar drought occurred at about the time when James wrote. The people were instant in prayer; and at a time when the clouds promised no response were blest with a copious shower. Jos. "Ant.," 18: 8, 6. Eusebius mentions a parallel instance of an answer to prayers for rain in the case of the Thundering Legion in the war with the Marcomanni. "Hist." 5: 5.

18. And he prayed again—better, *and again he prayed.* It is noticeable that this second prayer, uttered by Elijah, was founded upon the promise previously given, before he set forth from Zarephath. (1 Kings 18: 1-42.) This circumstance suggests that the first prayer also was preceded by a revelation of God's will. Without such warrant, it is not safe to invoke a judgment upon wrong doers, whether of drought or of fire "as Elijah did." **And the heaven gave rain, and the earth brought forth her fruit**—such as she is accustomed to bear. Both these personifications express strikingly the success of Elijah's prayer. And the refreshment and relief thus obtained encourages our intercessions for others, that they may receive the richer blessings of the skies. For here too a promise may be pleaded: "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground. I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed and my blessing upon thine offspring. And they shall spring up as among the grass, as willows by the watercourses. One shall say, I am the Lord's, and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord, and surname himself by the name of Israel." (Isa. 44: 3-5.) Perhaps this latent suggestion in the passage prepared the way for the succeeding verses which relate to the conversion and salvation of souls.

3. *Slowness to wrath.* Instead of striving with men as rivals or persecutors, seek to save them. Ver. 19, 20.

19. Instead of the wrath, which James denounces as contrary to the genius of the gospel (3: 13; 4: 17), he exhibits the Christian spirit as a loving interest in the salvation of sinners—a thought with which the Epistle appropriately ends. **Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth**—better, *if any one among you be led astray from the truth.* The expression indicates a wandering away from the principles of the gospel, and from such a course of life as those principles require and enforce; it embraces errors of the understanding, such as unbelief and superstition, and also departures from the ways of duty and virtue. The word of truth is the word of life, and the way of truth is the way of life. **And one convert him**—recall the wandering soul to faith and virtue. Such was the grand office assigned to John the Baptist

20 Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins.

who converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins.

among the erring Jews at the beginning of the Gospel Dispensation. (Luke 1: 16, 17.) And to the same sublime office of philanthropy is every Christian called.

20. Let him (the converter) **know** the great results achieved by such evangelistic undertakings and labors. **That he who converteth a sinner from the error of his way.** The general definition of a sinner is a wanderer from the truth. (Ver. 19.) Error is the contrast to the truth. This proposition, which serves as the foundation of Wollaston's ingenious treatise on "The Religion of Nature," § 1, on Moral Good and Evil, pp. 4–52, is here assumed as undoubtedly true. Just as certainly as truth saves, error degrades and destroys. **Shall save a soul from death.** The 'soul' is that spiritual part which, through the divine blessing and in the use of the means of grace, may attain eternal salvation, and which, on the other hand, by the neglect or rejection of the gospel, incurs eternal ruin. He who converts a sinner saves a soul from destruction, and thus secures for an endangered and guilty fellow creature an eminent and abiding good. Of all philanthropists, the zealous, loving Christian is the greatest. He alone saves the soul from the loss of that life which alone is worth the living; from that misery begotten by sin, beginning on earth, enduring and increasing after the death of the body, and continuing forever. **And shall hide** (*cover*) **a multitude of sins.** This is commonly regarded as meaning that the sins of the person converted are, as it were, hidden from the eyes of God, in being forgiven. These are 'a multitude'; for every act of a moral agent has a moral character, and therefore a heart at enmity to God is perpetually sinning against him. "The plowing of the wicked is sin." Yet we prefer to regard the phrase as having the meaning of the parallel passages, Prov. 10: 12; 1 Peter 4: 8, etc., whose theme is the covering of sins by charity. Labor for the spiritual welfare of others would be the most effective way of soothing the discords which James is here recalling, as he shows the more excellent way of charity. Christians would find it easier to forgive the wrongs and insults of others, if they regarded others as fellow sinners needing the gospel and journeying with them to the bar of God. However numerous these sins may be, Christian charity can cover them all. Solomon says: "Love covereth all sins." Peter says: "Love shall cover the multitude of sins." It can hardly be in a different meaning that James uses the same proverbial phrase. The Syriac reads: "He who turneth the sinner from the error of his way will resuscitate his soul from death, and will cover the multitude of his sins."

COMMENTARY

ON THE

EPISTLES OF PETER.

BY

NATHANIEL MARSHMAN WILLIAMS, D. D.

PHILADELPHIA
THE AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY
1701-1703 CHESTNUT STREET

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1888, by the
AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

Printed in U. S. A.

PREFACE.

THIS attempt to expound the Epistles of Peter and the Epistle of Jude is the attempt of one who has spent life chiefly in the work of a preacher and pastor, not in the work of a professional exegete. Such a mode of life ought, perhaps, to have deterred from the attempt. But, however that may be, the writer may be permitted to say that, while aiming to adapt the work to the wants of the people, he is not without hope that some of his brethren in the ministry, who, though not exegetes by profession, have been more or less accustomed to the study of the Greek, may find at least something to aid, even them, in the better understanding of these remarkable Epistles. In his treatment of the very difficult, and, as he cannot but think, greatly misunderstood passage concerning the preaching of Christ to the spirits in prison, he acknowledges his indebtedness to S. C. Bartlett, D. D., President of Dartmouth College, for what manifestly is the true view of the Greek. Owing to what has been denominated "the new movement" in theology—so far as that movement pertains to the subject of a second probation—this part of Peter's First Epistle (3 : 18–20) is worthy of very careful study. Another topic now commanding much interest is the relation of wives to their husbands, and upon this the writer has ventured to express some general thoughts, besides endeavoring to educe the meaning of the verses bearing upon the subject. It is an interesting fact, that of the two apostles who have given practical precepts concerning the relation of husband and wife, the one was married and the other was unmarried. Sarcastic allusions to Paul's bachelorship are, therefore, less worthy of the source from which they flow. Here Paul the unmarried and Peter the married are one. In the Introduction to the Second Epistle of Peter will be found a brief consideration of the question recently sprung upon the attention of Christian scholars by Rev. Edwin A. Abbott, D. D., of England. It is claimed that a comparison of the Second Epistle with the writings of Josephus yields a new and unanswerable argument against the authority of the Epistle. It is a question of much importance, and will undoubtedly receive a yet more thorough examination.

The conditions upon which this work was to be prepared included preparation, if deemed needful by the writer, of Critical Notes, "as a vindication of the view presented." The writer has conformed to the condition, but, in doing so, has felt that such additional attempts are quite unworthy of being classed under a designation which appropriately means something so much higher.

As this part of "An American Commentary," a work so wisely under the general supervision of President Hovey, goes forth from the hand of the writer, it is his desire that it may not prove to be harmful, even if it fail to be helpful.

N. W. WILLIAMS.

Marshfield, Mass.

INTRODUCTION TO THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER.

I. PETER.

PETER, whose original name was Simon (see on 2 Pet. 1 : 1), though a native of Bethsaida, became a resident of Capernaum. His father bore the name of Jonas, or, according to some Greek manuscripts, John. See John 21 : 15, 16, 17, where, in the thrice-repeated question, the Revisers have, in accordance with the Greek of Westcott and Hort, *Simon, son of John.* In Matt. 16 : 17 are the names Simon Bar-jona (Bar-Jonah, in the Revision). Some would translate the Greek, Simon *son* of Jonah. Others take Bar-Jonah as a patronymic, like Bar Abbas, and Bar Timaeus. According to Dr. Schaff, Bar-Jona is a contraction for Bar-Joanna (Chaldaic)—*i. e.*, son of John. As to the name *Peter*, see on the first verse of the First Epistle. Our apostle had a brother who was called Andrew, and that he married is clear from Matt. 8 : 14, where it is said that his *wife's* mother was sick. His wife must have been then living; for in 1 Cor. 9 : 5 Paul makes distinct allusion to her as traveling with Peter. This was as late as A. D. 57, long after the sickness reported by Matthew.

Peter, in company with his father and brother, followed the business of fishing. He was not rich, yet he seems not to have been poor. He was not versed in Greek learning, nor in the learning of Rabbinic schools; yet there is no reason to doubt that he had a respectable share of such knowledge as prevailed among the people. Illiteracy, as known in the United States, in this year of grace, 1888, was not known in Palestine in the times of Christ and the apostles. In Acts he is indeed spoken of—and John not less—as *unlearned and ignorant*, "illiterate and obscure." This is what the rulers and elders and scribes "perceived." These having been educated in Rabbinic schools, were so far superior to Peter; but *unlearned* must not be so explained as to imply that the apostle had enjoyed none of the common opportunities of education. His social position, unlike, for example, that of Nicodemus, or that of Joseph of Arimathæa, was not among the aristocracy of Palestine; he was a plebeian. Amid the perils and toils of his daily life, he inclined to the service of God; for no sooner had John the Baptist made his public appearance, than Peter became interested in his mission, and this prepared him to take a step forward. He became a disciple of him of whom John was but the forerunner. ONE OF THE TWELVE, he was ONE OF THE THREE; for with James and John he shared the special confidence of Christ, and received special instruction. The "close companionship" of men so unlike as John and Peter in natural qualities is worthy of notice. See Mark 9 : 2; Luke 22 : 8; John 18 : 15; 20 : 2–8; Acts 3 : 1; 4 : 13. Each of the apostles had a distinctive temperament, and a distinctive cast of mind; but not one of them stands out in the Gospels with such clearness of outline, and such fullness of detail as does Peter; and, till Paul appears in Acts, no one even in that book is so prominent. It is impossible to mistake him for any other. But his prominence is not that of rank, or of office, but that of spiritual activity. Though he introduced the first Gentile into

the Christian Church, and may have been the means of introducing others, yet, acting with Paul upon the principle of a division of labor, he wrought, chiefly, for the spiritual good of Jews.

Of the latter part of Peter's life little is known. He disappears from the history in Acts after the Council in Jerusalem (15 : 7–11) A. D. 50 or 51. Thus, if we reckon from Pentecost, A. D. 33, he is kept before us seventeen years. Paul appears A. D. 36, fourteen or fifteen years before the disappearance of Peter, and remains before us till A. D. 63 or 64, the historian abruptly closing with the report of his activity in preaching while a prisoner in Rome. While, then, it is approximately correct that the former half of Acts is chiefly a record of Peter's labors, and the latter half a record of Paul's, it is an interesting fact that the two apostles, as is clear in the history itself, came into intimate Christian relations, and, contrary to what some have affirmed, lovingly wrought for the same spiritual end. Though Peter is seen no more in Acts after the Council, yet we catch glimpses of him in Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, and in his First Epistle to the Corinthians ; and though, as Farrar says, "From his own epistles we learn almost nothing about his biography," we do learn much of his innermost spirit. Tradition makes him to have gone very early to Rome, and to have founded the Roman Church ; but, if well sifted, the tradition is found to be chaff. That he went to Rome near the close of life, after the Roman Church was founded, and after the death of Paul, is strongly attested. He suffered martyrdom, and probably about A. D. 67.

The natural and spiritual characteristics of Peter are not less worthy of study than Paul's. His temperament, though not like Paul's, the best, was such as to make him capable of great activity and endurance. It was not the best, for it was such as to expose him to sudden and needless, sometimes very sinful, flashes of feeling ; and these reported themselves in explosives of startling force. He was not given to logical thinking, and was therefore not accustomed to draw conclusions. A blow hastily originated, and as hastily aimed, was his common way ; yet in most cases he meant well. His Divine Master was sincerely and warmly loved ; but failure to see the higher nature of his Master's mission caused him to speak sometimes in words which were more unseemly than the spirit which lay behind them. Of one terrible exception no one needs to be reminded. What may charitably be considered as only faults growing out of his temperament, culminated at last in—

> . . . "the deep disgrace
> Of weakness."

As Longfellow continues—

> "We shall be sifted till the strength
> Of self-conceit be changed at length
> To meekness."

The flashy nature of the apostle became a miracle of continuous energy and boldness, clothed, as shown in his First Epistle, in tenderness and persuasiveness scarcely inferior to John's. After the ascension, one instance of inconsistency with his own principles, and only one, occurred ; and, what must be considered as a striking interposition on behalf of the new faith, that did not occur till God had brought into the church one who was quick to see, and bold to resist Peter's vacillation. See Gal. 2 : 11–14. In view of our apostle's natural characteristics, it must be said that his spiritual life became such, under the teachings of Christ, followed by the baptism of the Holy Spirit, as to afford

scarcely less proof of his supernatural endowment than is given of Paul's by Paul's conversion and life.

This sketch of Peter's life would be incomplete without allusion to the apostle's influence in the writing of the Gospel of Mark. The belief that he had something to do in the preparation of that gospel is well founded; but precisely what he did is uncertain, and probably can never be determined. See a discussion of the question in Dr. W. N. Clarke's Commentary on Mark, belonging to the present series—Introduction, "The relation of Peter to this Gospel," pp. 10–12. What proportion of the remarkable vivacity of the gospel is due to Mark, and what proportion to Peter, it would be equally impossible to decide. Little, however, is hazarded in saying that the gospel, compared with the two epistles, and viewed in the light of Peter's characteristics, bears in a marked degree the imprint of Peter's mind.

II. THE OBJECT OF THE EPISTLE.

This is given in 5 : 12. It was both hortatory and confirmatory. If persecution by the civil power had not yet fallen upon the Churches of Asia Minor, yet there was reason to believe that the danger was not far off; and it is clear that the Christians of that region were suffering from the tongues of those among whom they lived. They needed patience to bear the revilings of the wicked, and faith to meet the coming storm of governmental power. They also needed new assurance that the religion of Christ was divine. The exhortations are enforced by the fact that they had been called by the grace of God, by the fact of the sufferings of Christ, by the nearness of Christ's coming, and by the glory which awaits them in heaven.

III. THE PLAN OF THE EPISTLE.

The plan is not obvious, and therefore is not easily given. The thought advances, but not so consecutively as in some of Paul's epistles. This is less surprising, as doctrinal teaching, which requires argument, and therefore more orderly and condensed thinking, was not a part of the apostle's design. The introduction may be considered as embraced in the first twelve verses, and the conclusion in the last five. Between these parts occur three series of exhortations: the first, pertaining to their own individual life (1 : 13–2 : 10); the second, to their relations to others—servants in their relations to masters, wives in their relations to husbands, husbands in their relations to wives, and all in their relations to people of the world (2 : 11–4 : 6); the third, to their own individual life again (4 : 7–5 : 9). In the last is a commingling of the consolatory. In concluding, the apostle expresses the divine purpose in the form of a promise (see upon 5 : 10), gives utterance to a doxology, expresses the object of writing the Epistle, sends greetings, and pronounces the customary benediction.

IV. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EPISTLE.

These are not in accordance with the characteristics of Paul or of John. Peter's traits of character and peculiarities of mind are everywhere visible. It is not impossible that such an epistle could have been written by Peter, even if Peter's experience during the Lord's ministry had been different; but it is certain that the Epistle is colored by his experience as it actually was. Illustrations of this will be cited in the Notes.[1] Yet

[1] *Horæ Petrinæ*, by Dean Howson, though, as the writer himself remarks, fragmentary, and its subject-matter capable of fuller treatment, is an interesting view of the point referred to.

it is a striking proof of his present greater breadth of religious views and stronger faith in the unseen and eternal. It is characterized by little less originality than the epistles of Paul. Some of the thoughts are found in no other part of the Scriptures, and some are as "hard to be understood" (2 Pet. 3: 16) as anything in the writings of that profoundest of all the inspired writers. While distinctly evangelical, and so far in union with the teachings of Christ and Paul, it is permeated, like the Gospel of Matthew, with the spirit of the Old Testament, as seen in its very numerous quotations. In no respect does it teach views opposed to those taught by Paul. While there were some in that early age of Christianity who said "I am of Paul," and some who said "I am of Peter," neither the one apostle nor the other allowed himself to be the head of a party. The doctrines which Paul taught directly and fully Peter taught indirectly and in part. The exhortations of the Epistle imply all the great doctrines of the Christian faith. The Epistle contains not a trace of assumption of rank over the other apostles. It is simply the Epistle of Peter an apostle, and he seems almost to foretell the bold assumption of the papal power; for, in addressing the elders, he calls himself a co-elder. See on 5 : 1. Too much has been made of the admitted similarity existing between some parts of this Epistle and some parts of the Epistle to the Romans, and of that to the Ephesians. Similarities between our Epistle and that of James have also been noticed. The early Christians, not excepting the apostles themselves, would as naturally fall into similar forms of language in expressing the more common thoughts as Christians of our own times. There is nothing improbable, however, in the supposition that Peter had become so familiar with some of Paul's forms of expression as either purposely or unconsciously to use them. Such imitations, conscious or unconscious, may be seen by comparing Mic. 4 : 1–3 with Isa. 2 : 2–4, and Ezek. 31 : 14–18 ; 32 : 18–32 with Isa. 14 : 9–19. See the article "Isaiah," in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," pp. 1151, 1164. Isaiah and Micah were contemporaneous, and may have heard each other.

V. THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE EPISTLE.

That Peter was the author is undoubted. Many of the writers who followed the apostles, as Polycarp, a disciple of John; Papias, who wrote about A. D. 140–150; the Shepherd of Hermas, second century; the Peshito Version, before A. D. 150; the Old Latin Version, before A. D. 170; Basilides, a heretic of the earlier part of the second century; the churches in Vienne and Lyons in a letter written about A. D. 177; Tertullian, born in the latter half of the second century; Origen, A. D. 186–253; and Eusebius, A. D. 270–340—all awaken the belief, and some give positive proof by quotations, that they were acquainted with the Epistle, and knew it to be the work of Peter.

VI. THE READERS, TIME, AND PLACE.

The persons to whom the Epistle was sent are believed by some to have been Gentile Christians, but it contains strong evidence that they were chiefly Jewish Christians. That some were Gentiles is not improbable. The time, as judged by many, was A. D. 66. It might have been a little earlier. The place in which it was written was Babylon in Chaldea.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER.

CHAPTER I.

PETER, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia,

1 Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus,

Ch. 1: 1-12. INTRODUCTION, 1, 2; INSCRIPTION AND SALUTATION.

By an Epistle General is meant one directed not to any given church, but to Christians at large, though not necessarily to all Christians even of the same period. Those here addressed must be presumed to be members of churches. The Greek word for general is *katholike* (catholic). But in the best Greek Testament (Westcott and Hort) is a much shorter title—PETROU A, that is, "First of Peter." Revision: THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER.

1. Peter. Instead of standing last, as in modern times, the name of the writer stands first. He uses the name given him by Christ. (Matt. 16: 18.) *Petros* (Peter) is Greek, and means *rock*. In many places *Cephas* is used, which is a Syro-Chaldaic word, also meaning *rock*, and this may have been the name by which the other apostles and Christ were accustomed to address the writer of our Epistle. That Simon *was to be* "called Cephas (which is, by interpretation, Peter)," was declared by our Lord when Andrew brought him unto Jesus. (John 1: 42.) "Thou *art* Peter" was declared by Christ, when at a later period Simon made the ever-memorable confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." The new name expresses both the natural energy and the spiritual firmness for which this apostle was distinguished. But it was applied to him also, because before the conversion of Paul he was to be the chief agent in laying the foundation of Christianity. "Upon this rock I will build my church" refers therefore to Peter, not to Christ, not to Peter's confession. The other apostles, however, though less prominent in zeal and labor, are also the foundation upon which "the saints" are built. (Eph. 2: 20.)

An apostle of Jesus Christ. In mentioning his apostleship, he uses no such confirmatory expressions as are used by Paul in nearly all his epistles—e. g., *called* (Rom. 1: 1); *through the will of God* (1 Cor. 1: 1; 2 Cor. 1: 1; Eph. 1: 1; Col. 1: 1); *not from men* (Gal. 1: 1); *according to the commandment of God* (1 Tim. 1: 1). Reason: Paul's apostleship was called in question; Peter's was not. **To the strangers . . . elect.** In the Greek, 'elect' stands before the word translated 'strangers,' and the Revision has *the elect who are sojourners.* The persons addressed are described as *chosen.* Election is the loving purpose of God to save men. See Matt. 24: 31; Luke 18: 7; Rom. 8: 33. In these passages the adjective is used. The verb is used in the same sense. (Mark 13: 20; John 13: 18; Eph. 1: 4.) The noun *election* is so used. (Rom. 11: 5; 1 Thess. 1: 4; 2 Pet. 1: 10.) Here, as in many other places, it is the election, not of communities, but of individuals. Election should be considered, not so much as a dogma to be believed, as a fact to be felt and rejoiced in. The point of the harmonious meeting of God's in-working and man's out-working (Phil. 2: 12, 13) is as difficult for man to detect in the spiritual world as in the natural, *and no more so.* "It does not follow," says Huther, "that because individuals are elected all will attain the end for which God elected them," and we are referred to 2 Pet. 1: 10. But that passage and the very important words in Heb. 6: 4–6, with others of similar import, teach only the *possibility* of final apostasy; and the warning, for such it is, is to be regarded as a means by which the salvation of the elect is secured. **To the strangers scattered**—more exactly, *sojourners of the Dispersion.* In the time of Christ and the apostles, Jews were widely dispersed in lands more or less remote from Palestine, and this scattered body of Jews was called "The Dispersion." But there were several bodies of the Dispersion; as the Babylonian, the Egyptian, the Roman, the Syrian. See John 7: 35; James 1: 1. Allusions to the Dispersion are found in Acts 2: 9–11. Most of those who heard the gospel on the Day of Pentecost, Parthians and Medes, dwellers in Pontus and Asia, etc., belonged to the Dispersion. It is probable that many of those whom Peter now addresses by letter had heard his stirring words in Jeru-

2 Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace unto you, and peace, be multiplied.

2 Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace to you and peace be multiplied.

salem. 'Sojourners,' because dwelling in a country not their own. Jews felt that they were not at home when not in Palestine. In 2: 11 and in Heb. 11: 13, the word is used figuratively, for all Christians are only sojourners in this world; but here the word must be taken in the literal or national sense.

Pontus, bordering on the Black Sea, was the northeastern province of Asia Minor. On the western side of Pontus was **Galatia,** and on the southern, **Cappadocia. Asia** was the maritime part of Asia Minor, bordering on the Ægean Sea, and included, at least, Mysia, Lydia, and Caria, with Ephesus as the chief city. **Bithynia** was in the northwestern corner of Asia Minor, and was bounded on the north by the Black Sea. As Pontus was nearest Babylon, and Asia the farthest, it was natural for the writer to mention Pontus first and Asia last, if he wrote from Babylon; but if he wrote from Rome, it would not have been natural. These are geographical terms, but "each is the name of a province." (Dean Howson, Smith's "Dict. of Bible.")

2. According to the foreknowledge—in consequence of it as a divine rule. Foreknowledge is not the same as predestination or purpose. "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God.' (Acts 2: 23; compare Rom. 8: 29.) Though, strictly, foreknowledge and election, or foreordination, are each eternal, yet, in our conception, foreknowledge precedes foreordination, or the divine counsel. That is the conception which the apostle here expresses. That they were foreknown only as repenting and believing is neither affirmed or implied. What Peter teaches is that the election was based upon the foreknowledge. God foreknew; and whom he foreknew he elected. God could not be ignorant of his own purpose. (Eph. 1: 4, 5, 11; Rom. 8: 29, 30.) If the men to whom the apostle wrote were saints, they either made themselves saints, or they were made saints by God; and as the change was wrought by God, and as God does nothing without a purpose, he made them saints because he purposed to make them such; and as his purposes can have no beginning, his purpose to make them saints was an eternal purpose. Love was the source of all. Without the love, and the foreknowledge, and the purpose, the salvation of any would have been impossible. Election has too often been preached as mere doctrine: it should be preached as an expression of infinite love. **Through sanctification**—not *through sanctifying*. It expresses a state, not an act; not, 'through,' but *in*. The Greek preposition seldom expresses instrumentality. The meaning is, that they came into and continue in that state of sanctification or holiness of which the Holy Spirit is the ground or source. The Holy Spirit makes those holy whom the Father elects. No holiness without election; no election without holiness. **Unto obedience.** 'Unto' expresses result. The election led to this result: they became obedient. But is not faith the result of election, and obedience the fruit of faith? or, to say the least, is there not "obedience of" (or *to*) faith? See Rom. 1: 5. Peter, as well as Paul, held faith in the highest estimation. (Ver. 5, 8, 21; 2: 6.) It was to him the foundation of all Christian conduct; yet he could sometimes speak freely of obedience without first reminding the readers that faith is the root, and obedience only the fruit. Some think that 'obedience' is here used in so wide a sense as to include faith—faith being supposed to precede all other acts of obedience. The true explanation of the next clause makes this view probably correct. **And sprinkling of the blood**—sprinkling *with* the blood. Notice Peter's familiarity with the Old Testament. His escape, not less complete than Paul's, from Pharisaic bondage to the letter of the Mosaic Economy, is seen in the very use that here and elsewhere he makes of facts which occurred under that economy. Peter saw the spiritual import of the rites instituted by Moses. (The inconsistency which he showed at Antioch, and for which Paul reproved him, was exceptional.) Many things were sprinkled with the blood of animals (Lev. 4: 6; 16: 15, 19), and the people themselves (Ex. 24: 8); and as the blood of Christ was shed for sinners (Heb. 9: 11, 12; Col. 1: 14),

3 Blessed *be* the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath

3 Blessed *be* [1]the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his great mercy begat us

Or, *God and the Father.*

Peter addresses the elect as having obtained the precious boon of being sprinkled with the blood of Jesus. The apostle does not deem it necessary to express very clearly the distinction between the atonement and its application through faith; but as he is expressing the results of their election, he must have had in his conception the latter rather than the former. The sprinkling is the application of the atonement made by the shedding of Christ's blood on the cross. In his early Christian life, how unable was Peter to see that Christ must die! (Matt. 16: 22; Mark 9: 9, 10; 14: 47.) This inability led to some of his most unseemly utterances. The accurate and elevated views of the Epistle respecting the Messiah's death show the greatness of the change through which he passed. The evidence of the change is seen as early as the Day of Pentecost. (Acts 2: 23, 24.) **The Father.** The reference to the Father, to Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, though not proving the equality of the three, reminds us of it as taught elsewhere, and shows us the deep interest which Peter was persuaded each had in the salvation of men. **Grace and peace.** Both are gifts; but the latter is the fruit of the former. Grace is the love of God shown toward the undeserving. A being morally endowed who has never sinned, needs no grace. Peace comes from the consciousness of being justified before God. (Rom. 5: 1.) **Be multiplied.** God's grace may more and more abound, as also the peace which flows from it. Whether the salutations and benedictions of the epistles are only expressions of a wish, or are a kind of prophetic declaration, is not in every case easily determined. In Rom. 1: 7, and in some other places, no verb is used; and it is chiefly that which awakens the doubt. Here a verb is used, and in that mood which expresses a wish.

An epistle in the mere salutation of which the writer takes his flight, poised upon the eternal and electing love of God, and quickly sees men rising up new in the Holy Spirit and rejoicing in the atoning blood of Christ, cannot but be worthy of our profoundest and devoutest study.

3. Here begins the introduction proper, which extends through ver. 12. It is pervaded by the most elevated views of God's mercy, the Christian's inheritance, the benefit of afflictions, and the absorbing interest manifested in the work of Christ alike by prophets and angels. **Blessed be.** The Greek has no verb, and an omission of this kind "is very common," Buttmann says, "in all parts of the New Testament." What verb is to be supplied is in question. Some would supply a word which would make the formula expressive of a *desire* that God *may be* praised, including actual, conscious praise by the writer. Others (Buttmann) would supply the indicative (*is*), in which case we should have, *Blessed is the God and Father.* In support of this view is the fact that the Greek of this very verb is found in Rom. 1: 25 ("who *is* blessed for evermore"); and particularly 1 Pet. 4: 11 ("to whom *is* [Common Version *be*] praise and dominion"). The indicative seems to be preferable, though it is a question not easily decided. 'Blessed'—worthy of all praise. Compare Eph. 1: 3–14, between which and this is a deep undertone of inspired harmony, with characteristic variations. **Our Lord**—often applied to the Father as the Supreme Sovereign—is here and elsewhere applied to Christ as the Head of the New Dispensation. He is not here conceived as the Word (*Logos*, John 1: 1), but as the Messiah, in which character he is ever, as here, represented as subordinate to the Father. (Col. 1: 3; Rom. 15: 6; 1 Cor. 15: 24, 28.) Yet we may speak of Christ, even in his Messianic character, as the Word that became flesh. (John 1: 14.) *Our* Lord! is the exultant cry of the elect. **According to his abundant mercy**—in consequence of it. The elect are not begotten in consequence of anything which they themselves do. The preposition indicates that the ground of God's begetting was his mercy. 'Abundant'—God's mercy, viewed as a quiescent attribute, is great; showing it is greater than creating ten thousand worlds. It is the greatest act which God can do. It is an attribute for the exercise of which there is no call, except toward the sinful, and

begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead,
4 To an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you,

again unto a living hope by the resurrection of
4 Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not
5 away, reserved in heaven for you, who by the power

without this the sinful would remain sinful. **Hath begotten us**—better, *begat us*. It was a single and finished act in the past, which the Greek language was able to express by what is called the Aorist tense. We shall meet with many such instances, which in most cases the Revised Version recognizes, but which the Common Version very often overlooks. Making the sinful spiritually new is one act, quickly wrought, by which the depraved nature is so changed that the subject thenceforth loves the Creator and all that the Creator loves. **Again** puts this spiritual act in contrast with the act by which the readers began their natural life. 'Begat'—figurative and very expressive. (John 3: 3.) But they were no more begotten into fully developed Christians than they were begotten into fully developed intellectual and bodily life. Regeneration is only the beginning of spiritual life; but if, from the time when it is supposed to take place, there is no growth, nothing can be admitted as evidence that it occurred at all. **Unto a lively hope.** Says Paul to the Ephesians, "Having no hope." This was the sad state of even the most cultivated Gentiles at the birth of Christ. From some of the sepulchral inscriptions came affecting evidence of the hopelessness of man, and from the lips of modern skepticism fall words which echo the inscriptions.

> The weariest and most loathed worldly life,
> That age, ache, penury, and imprisonment
> Can lay on nature, is a paradise
> To what we fear of death.

Blessed with a written revelation, the Jews were the only people who can be said to have had hope of a future happy existence; and their hope had firmness of foundation only so far as it rested on the promise of a coming Saviour. **Lively**—*living, life-producing, and abiding*. It refers, not merely to eternal life as an object of hope, but to the life which accompanies the hope; and this life is blissful even here. A hope with no life would leave us where the Romans were, without a written revelation, and where the Jews were with a revelation while trusting in the traditions which they added to it. **By the resurrection.** Connect this not with '*living*' (living in consequence of Christ's resurrection), nor with 'begotten,' but with 'living hope.' The living hope into which they were begotten had its ground in the resurrection of Christ. (1 Cor. 15: 13, 20.) The true view of a blissful life for the saints includes the view of a resurrection of the body. The disembodied state, in the comparatively brief period between death and the resurrection, was regarded by the apostles as exceptional and unnatural. The resurrection of Jesus Christ settled the great question of a future re-embodying, blissful state. The hope will not disappoint. (Rom. 5: 5.) Christians are now showing far too little interest in the general resurrection, and too seldom does this crowning fact of Christianity find place in the pulpit.

4. To an inheritance—some say *patrimony*—that is, something the possession of which passed over legally from father to son; and so the kingdom of God may be viewed as a patrimony which fell to the readers as sons of God, as heirs. It is probable, however, that the word is here used in the more general sense of *possession*, chiefly in its completed form in heaven. It is so used in both the Old Testament and the New. (Acts 7: 5; Heb. 11: 8.) The land of Canaan was called the possession of the Jews. These saints of Asia Minor were begotten to a possession—the kingdom of God. How rich were they! Three well-chosen adjectives describe it. **Incorruptible**—God is said to be incorruptible (Rom. 1: 23); the raised body also (1 Cor. 15: 53, 54), while the buried body is called corruptible. The incorruptible possession to which men are begotten is one which is secure from perishing through any essential defect of its own. **Undefiled**—*free from impurity; a holy possession*. **Fadeth not away**—suggested, perhaps, by the fading nature of all earthly beauty. Of the possession, therefore, viewed as beautiful, we may exclaim, as Milton sings of the imaginary flower of the earthly paradise: "Immortal amaranth!" **Reserved**—*kept in store*, not merely stored up, but kept, watched over, so that it may not be lost to us. By this possession is not meant heaven; for it is kept for us in heaven, the latter being viewed not as a state, but as the place in

5 Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time.
6 Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need

of God are guarded through faith unto a salvation
6 ready to be revealed in the last time. Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a little while, if need

which. In respect to security, the possession is infinitely superior to those earthly treasures which rust can corrupt, and thieves steal; and to gold, which is ever losing weight, and, therefore, value. The value of the saints' possession will forever increase.

5. Are kept—*are guarded.* Though Peter does not here use the same word for "kept" (reserved) as in ver. 4, yet the idea is nearly the same. The possession is kept for those begotten, and those begotten are guarded for the possession—double security. The saints not kept, the possession would go unpossessed; the possession not kept, the saints would find themselves begotten to eternal poverty. See a military use of the word "kept" in 2 Cor. 11: 32. God watches over us and guards, and so keeps us. **By the power of God.** The Greek preposition for *by* is used here also (ἐν, *in*). We are kept *in* the power of God, in that the power of God is the element in which we are kept. God, as the God of power, is the cause of the keeping, and the cause becomes effective by our being in it. But we are not kept irrespective of a given mental constitution. God honors his creative wisdom by requiring the use of our free will. (Phil. 2: 12.) **Through faith**—*by means of faith.* Faith is twofold—the assent of the intellect and the trust of the heart; more briefly, assent and trust. One may have the former (James 2: 19.) without the latter; one cannot have the latter without the former. For many instructive illustrations of faith, see the Old Testament; and see Heb. 11 for the same facts grouped and condensed. Faith in God comprehends faith concerning all that he has revealed to us, whether in matter or in mind; all that he has promised, and all that he has required; and therefore it includes, as of surpassing importance, faith in his Son, Jesus Christ, as the infallible Teacher, the Almighty Worker, the propitiating Redeemer. He who desires to be saved should not be unwilling to believe; and he who is unwilling to believe gives little evidence of sincerity in desiring to be saved. See on the word "believe," ver. 8. **Unto salvation.** Connect this neither with 'begotten,' in ver. 3, nor with 'faith,' but with 'kept.' We are kept unto salvation. Salvation is the end, God's great mercy (ver. 3) the ground, and faith the means. Salvation is here used in a broad sense, including deliverance from sin and punishment, and the attainment of holiness and bliss. It may be synonymous with 'inheritance' in ver. 4; only there the apostle's heart glows with the *nature* of the possession, as is clear from the adjectives he employs. From the first word to the word 'salvation,' this verse is a clear echo of Peter's experience; and many such echoes shall we hear as we advance through the Epistle. See Luke 22: 31, 32. Peter himself was kept in the early part of his Christian life through faith, his faith being the fruit of his Master's prayers. "When once thou hast turned again, confirm thy brethren." (Luke 22: 32, Rev. Ver.) This Peter is now faithfully doing, and will continue to do throughout the Epistle. **Ready**—in the plan and purpose of God. **To be revealed**—to be brought out yet more distinctly to their apprehension, and especially to become their actual and conscious possession. "A *present* salvation" is a form of words quite current among some, and expresses a Scriptural fact; but salvation in its completed form does not become the believer's till 'the last time.' **The last time.** Much difference of opinion has been awakened concerning this phrase. See "the last day" (John 6: 39, 40, 44, 54; 11: 24; 12: 48); "the last days" (Acts 2: 17; 2 Tim. 3: 1; James 5: 3); "these last days" (Heb. 1: 2); "these last times" (1 Pet. 1: 20); "the last time" (1 John 2: 18); "the end" (1 Cor. 15: 24). "*The last days*" (in Peter's Pentecostal address) undoubtedly covers the entire Christian Era. The days of that period are called "the last," because the period was "the world's last great moral epoch." (Dr. H. B. Hackett, "Commentary on the Acts," belonging to the present series.) The words before us cannot refer to the entire period of the Christian Economy, but to the end of it. How soon the last day was to come is not affirmed. Huther says: "The entire manner of expression indicates that he hoped it was near." (4: 7.) But concerning the question, see more on 4: 7.

6. Greatly rejoice—not, *will* rejoice, for the verb is not used in a future sense.

son, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations:
7 That the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ:

7 be, ye have been put to grief in manifold trials, that the proof of your faith, *being* more precious than gold that perisheth though it is proved by fire, might be found unto praise and glory and honour at the

Wherein refers not to "the last time," but to the fact of being kept. The writer may also have in his eye the fact mentioned in ver. 4. 'Greatly rejoice' is the translation of one word in the Greek, and that expressive of joy very intense. A milder word could have been used; but it was not like Peter to express himself weakly, and notwithstanding their trials the readers' state of mind required the stronger word. Here is no exaggeration (Peter had long ago thrown off that habit), though some find it difficult to see how Christians can justly be described as exultant when "put to grief in manifold trials." (Revised Version.) But see the yet stronger representation in ver. 8. The face of the statue of a distinguished American of the last century was at first thought by some imaginative minds to smile on the one side, and to wear a serious aspect on the other. It is certain that Paul and his companions were sorrowful, yet were always rejoicing. (2 Cor. 6: 10. See 3: 14; 4: 13.) Sorrow under trials and joy under conscious divine support, and in the certainty of final salvation, are not only possible, but have, even in our own times, many signal illustrations. **Now for a season**—*for a little time.* Great as it is, the joy is accompanied by, or occasionally intermitted by, sorrow. 'Now' cannot refer to the entire life, though even that compared with eternity would be 'a little time'; but it refers to the brief period of trials through which they are passing. The apostle here also would confirm his brethren by speaking of the brevity of their sorrow. **If need be.** This modifies 'ye are in heaviness.' God may see it to be *necessary* that ye sorrow. **Temptations**—*trials*, chiefly oppositions by the wicked, whether persecutions by the civil power or slander (2: 12), and the difficulties to which these led, as poverty, or disarrangement of business. **Manifold**—*of various kinds.* They are called 'temptations,' not in the special sense of enticements to sin (James 1: 13), but in the sense of proofs or tests. A word signifying temptation, instead of a word meaning test, was preferable, because the afflictions were really permitted for the purpose of putting their faith to a sufficient strain to prove its genuineness, and to make it stronger. See the instructive language, 4: 12. Complaining under trials is proof that the complainer needed them, and that a few more might not be amiss. **Through**—*in* is better, as in the Revised Version.

7. The end or object of their trials. **Trial** here indicates not the means or the process, but the result, thus: that the tried or proved excellence of your faith. The excellence was to be proved such by the tests applied. See Rom. 5: 3–5. Strong tests, great faith. Temptation, therefore, in the sense of test, ought not to expose to criticism, as it often does, those to whom it is applied. It may prove them to be objects of special love (Job 42: 10, 12; Heb. 12: 6, 7), while their critics may deserve to be visited with special displeasure. (Job 42: 7.) **Much more precious.** Faith? or faith as proved to be excellent? The latter. The end of their trials is, that the proved excellence of their faith may be found more precious than gold—not '*of* gold,' as in the Common Version. See Job 28: 10; Jer. 9: 7. **That perisheth.** Tested faith is contrasted with gold. The latter is perishable. Its nature is such that it will perish. The former is imperishable (Luke 22: 32), and so we have another echo of Peter's experience—a "reminiscence," Dean Howson might have called it. See his "Horæ Petrinæ," Chap. X., Reminiscences in the First Epistle. **Though it be tried with fire**—*though it is proved by fire*—another quality of that gold with which faith is compared. Gold as well as faith is declared to be tried—*i. e.*, proved, tested. Faith is proved by afflictions; gold by fire. But tested faith is more precious than tested gold. **Might be found**—a significant expression. It is not equivalent to *might be.* It indicates the result of searching; may be found after the searching investigations of the Judgment Day. See 2: 22: "Neither was guile *found* in his mouth." **Praise** and **honor** and **glory**—though *their own*, will be the result of divine working. Contempt and slander were the coin with which the world

8 Whom having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see *him* not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory:

8 revelation of Jesus Christ: whom not having seen ye love; on whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice greatly with joy unspeakable,
9 and [1]full of glory: receiving the end of your faith,

1 Gr. *glorified.*

paid off the elect of Asia Minor; but in the balance of the Last Judgment something will be found on the other side. **At the appearing**—*revelation* or *manifestation.* See ver. 13; 4: 13; 2 Thess. 1: 7; 1 Cor. 1: 7, where the word is used, as here, relative to the second coming of Christ; but when that will occur is not here said. See on 4: 7.

8. The apostle's reference to Christ's second coming easily suggests a connecting link between that and the leading thought of the verse—their rejoicing. The link is this: that these Christians of Asia Minor, living far from the scene of Christ's labors, had had no personal acquaintance with Christ. **Whom having not seen**—better, as in the Revision, *not having seen.* Sight is supposed by many to be necessary to the awakening of love. Peter had seen Christ; but he does not teach that love is conditioned upon sight. What the character of Christ was they had learned by the preaching of Paul and others. They loved him, therefore. Personal acquaintance with Christ as a condition of loving him is as needless for men now as it was then. The verse should be carefully compared with John 20: 29. **In whom** may be connected with **believing**, or with **rejoice**; the former is to be preferred. **Now** belongs only to **see not.** As implied in the first clause, they do not see him; but in this clause the fact is emphasized that they do not see him **now.** Thus it is implied that they will see him at his revelation. By the conjunctions **though** and **yet** too much contrast is made between not seeing and believing. Some contrast is intended, but not as great as in John 20: 20, where a blessing is pronounced upon those who become believers without first seeing. The literal translation is, *in whom, now not seeing, but believing.* The readers having never had an opportunity to see Christ according to the flesh, Peter reminds them that their state is one not of seeing, but of believing. Such has been the state of nearly all who have become believers—that is, nearly all who have believed, have believed by means of testimony. **In whom believing.** In the New Testament sense, *to believe* is much more than *to give credit to,* which was the sense as used by common Greek writers. When Christ came, the Greek word took on a new meaning. To believe on (*in*) Christ is to rely on him as being, being to us, all that he professes to be. It is *to resign one's self unto Christ.* **Ye rejoice**—*ye exult.* The same intense word that is used in ver. 6 is here made by the translators, in consequence of the words which follow, unnecessarily weaker. Some, thinking that these afflicted Christians could not so rejoice, insist that the verb, though in the present tense, must be taken as a future; but as in ver. 6 so here the apostle describes present joy. See on ver. 6. **Unspeakable**—joy which cannot be expressed, or, perhaps, cannot be exhausted, in words. **Full of glory**—literally, *glorified.* In its completed degree, it is to be referred to heaven, but foregleams of it are often to be seen here. The joy of the world is anything but glorious. How often is the joy of the world assumed for the purpose of hiding sorrow! The joy of irrational animals is never assumed.

REMARKS.

No English reader should be surprised to learn that, like the manuscripts of all other books which have descended from antiquity, those of the Bible, made by hand before printing was invented, contain *variations of reading,* so called. That is to say, one manuscript *varies* from another in the spelling, or the omission, or the place, of a word. Most of these variations are very slight, as a long vowel in one manuscript, and a short one in another; one kind of accent in one, and another kind of accent in another; an adjective preceding its noun in one, and following it in another. A word, and even many words, may be found in one manuscript which are wanting in all the others. The Greek and Roman classics contain far greater variations than the Bible. Shakespeare's plays give evidence, in the notes of editors and commentators, of much more serious variations of reading than the New Testament, though the former were written less than three hundred

9 Receiving the end of your faith, *even* the salvation of *your* souls.
10 Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and

10 *even* the salvation of *your* souls. Concerning which salvation the prophets sought and searched dili-

years ago. The folio edition of Othello (1623), for example, "contains one hundred and sixty-three lines which are not found in the quarto" (1622), and "there is a quarto edition of 1630 which differs in some readings from both of the previous editions." Speaking of Lear, an editor says: "Large passages which are found in the quartos are omitted in the folio; and some lines are found in the folios which are not in the quartos; and these are, for the most part, essential to the progress of the action, or to the development of character." There are no less than four different readings of the eighth line of Macbeth. It must be attributed to the ever-watchful providence of God that the principal manuscripts of the New Testament, so many hundred years older than the writings of Shakespeare, vary so little that not a doctrine taught by Christ or his apostles has been put in jeopardy. Learned and pious men have done a work for which all men should be grateful, in examining and comparing them, that the correct reading may be ascertained. It may be added that many of the most valuable manuscripts, including the four oldest, were "entirely unknown" to King James' translators.[1] Now that they are known, the importance of thoroughly examining and comparing them, that a more correct Greek text, and from that a more correct English Bible, may be obtained, is obvious. (See Crit. Notes.)

9. Receiving—~~receiving as a prize~~. Those who make the rejoicing future make the receiving future. But the **end,** the consequence or result, of their faith is received in this life. The participle in the Greek is the present. Yet doubtless Peter intends to remind them that they receive the completed end, the *end ended*, and that can be realized only at the second coming of Christ. (Ver. 5.) **Faith . . . salvation.** So divine a beginning "must needs" have so divine an end—'Salvation.' See on ver. 5. The frequency with which Peter refers to the result of all trials and all joys shows the strength of his conviction and the intensity of his feelings concerning that particular point. Let us in this respect be like him. **Your souls**—literally, *souls*. There is no Greek for 'your.' Not to the exclusion of the deliverance of the body from imperfection (Rom. 8:23), but only the soul is specified because it is the chief part of that which is benefited by the work of Christ.

10-12. The swift but untired wing of the apostle, bearing the spirit forward to the glorious end, is not thereby unfitted to fall back to the earth, and to touch once more the soil of Israel. For the very purpose of throwing a brighter halo around the future, the writer takes us back to the past, as if even from the ministration of death some rays of glory might be gathered which will brighten the ministration of the Spirit. (2 Cor. 3:7, 8.) This closing part of the Introduction contains three chief thoughts: That prophets showed the deepest interest in the salvation mentioned (ver. 10); that their interest centred around the question of the time when the Messiah's sufferings and glories were to occur (ver. 11); that they were informed by revelation that the great things upon which they were engaged were not for themselves, but for men of future times (ver. 12). These points are presented, especially in the original, with an energy of style characteristic of our apostle.

10. Of which—*in respect to which*. **The prophets**—rather, *prophets*. He refers to prophets as a class. In striking accord is this representation by Peter with what he had heard, "privately," with other disciples, from his Divine Teacher. See the very interesting passage in Luke 10: 23, 24, of which the words before us are an echo—a "reminiscence." It need not be said that the apostle refers only to *good* prophets, for it is clear that Peter proceeds upon the assumption that prophets were good men. A bad man, as Balaam (2 Pet. 2:15), might give utterance occasionally to a prophecy concerning some one thing (John 11: 51, 52); but those who were prophets by profession were called to their work by divine prompting and were good men. A prophet, in the Old Testament sense, was one who received communications from God and declared them to others. This might or might not be in the form of prediction.

1 *Revisers:* for the Common Version was in no proper sense a translation.

searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace *that should come* unto you:

11 Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.

12 Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down

gently, who prophesied of the grace that *should*
11 *come* unto you: searching what *time* or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto, when it testified beforehand the sufferings [1] of Christ, and the glories that should follow
12 them. To whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto you, did they minister these things, which now have been announced unto you through those who preached the gospel unto you [2] by the Holy Spirit sent forth from heaven; which things angels desire to look into.

1 Gr. *unto*.....2 Gr. *in*.

One of the functions of the prophets was teaching; but predicting future events was one of the chief characteristics of ancient prophecy. The coming, the sufferings, and death of the Messiah, with the spreading glories of his kingdom, even to victory over all foes, were the most important of all the prophecies. See especially the remarkable fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. **Have inquired and searched diligently**—literally, *sought diligently and searched diligently.* In the Greek both verbs express very earnest investigation of the question before them. Successive generations of prophets concentrating their powers upon any point involved in the work of saving men, is a picture in remarkable contrast with that of men searching for perishable gold. The second clause of the verse may be read thus: *Who prophesied of the grace for you*—i. e., *appointed for* you. It hints at the divine intention. **Grace.** See on ver. 2.

11. What, or what manner of time—*unto what*—i. e., unto *what time* (definite future time); or, unto *what kind* of time—time marked by what kind of condition or circumstances. They earnestly sought to know both the exact time and the nature of the time. These two points involved desire to know more of him who was to suffer. They wanted to know more than they wrote, and to understand better what they did write. **The Spirit of Christ.** The Being who was known among the Jews as Jesus the Son of Mary is here clearly assumed to have had existence in the several periods of prophetic inquiry. His Spirit, either his own spirit or the Holy Spirit, was in the prophets. In either case the effect was the same. It was by *the Spirit* that the things were revealed to prophets, and declared to them beforehand. The two facts, that the coming Deliverer was to suffer, and that his sufferings were to be followed by **glory**—rather, *glories*—were not the result of the investigation which prophets made, but of teaching by the Spirit of Christ, and that Spirit is not to be conceived in this case as external to them, and so as merely suggesting the facts to their minds, but as in them. Their entire spiritual being was pervaded by that Spirit, and therefore they knew of the sufferings and the glories. See Rev. 22: 6. "And the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angel," etc.; or, according to the correct Greek, "The Lord God of the spirits of the prophets"; and see in the Commentary of this series Dr. J. A. Smith's interpretation. **Sufferings of Christ**—sufferings *for* Christ, appointed for Christ. 'Glories.' The glory "of the resurrection, of the ascension, the present session at the right hand of God, of the second advent, and the new creation, and Israel restored, and the church perfected, and the everlasting kingdom." (Dr. John Lillie, "Lectures on Peter.") What prophets longed to know was the more particular fact concerning *the time when.* We are longing to know when Christ's second advent will come; prophets longed to know when the final glory will come; but, like them, we have not the means of deciding.

12. While they prophesied, it was at the same time **revealed** unto them that **not unto themselves,** not for their own good, **but unto us** (*you* is the approved reading), for the good of Christians in Peter's time, and all times following, they **did minister** by *announcing* or *declaring.* Peter speaks from his own standpoint. *He* can see that prophets ministered to the elect of his own time: prophets themselves knew by revelation the general fact that they ministered to persons who were to live in some future unknown time. **The things**—*these things*, as in the Revised Version; the same things which preachers of the gospel have declared, the sufferings and glories of Christ, and whatever particulars are embraced under these general divisions. **With the Holy Ghost**—

from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into.
13 Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ;

13 Wherefore girding up the loins of your mind, be sober and set your hope perfectly on the grace that [1]is to be brought unto you at the revelation

1 Gr. *is being brought.*

in the Holy Spirit, that is, by the aid of whose in-dwelling power the gospel was preached to you. **Sent down**—*sent forth.* "Nowhere else," says Lillie, "out of more than one hundred and thirty instances, does the English version add *down* to the meaning of ἀποστέλλω," the Greek verb here used. Preaching without the Holy Spirit is "forced work." **Which things.** Again the apostle rises from earth to heaven. **The angels** (omit the article), 'angels,' as well as prophets, though having no personal need of redemption (Heb. 2: 16) **desire**—*earnestly desire.* **To look into.** If the original meaning of the word were allowed to govern the meaning here, the angels are represented as stooping down and looking intently at something. To say the least, they are represented as earnestly desiring *to know* the things referred to in ver. 11. It does not imply that angels are very ignorant of what has been done to save men (Luke 2: 11, 14; 22: 43); but it expresses their strong desire to know all that is possible relative to this most wonderful work of divine love. See the very interesting words of Christ Luke 10: 24. Notice the present tense, 'desire.' They desire now, and they have desired ever since Peter wrote. They are still longing to know more, and are ever learning something new concerning the salvation of men. Why should men themselves be indifferent? In these two verses (11, 12) is striking proof of the *inspiration* of the prophets. See 2 Pet. 1: 21.

Ch. 1: 13-2: 10. First Series of Exhortations.

The introduction is ended, and now begins the first series of exhortations. The former is the doctrinal basis of the latter. In Paul's Epistle to the Romans, the doctrinal basis constitutes the larger part, while here it is the smaller part. Peter and Paul are so far alike that their exhortations spring from doctrine; but they differ in the degree of prominence given to the two parts. While the Holy Spirit was indeed their guide, it is also true that Paul, by his mental constitution, was more given to doctrinal reasoning than Peter. The example of each apostle is a reproof to ministers, so far as they allow their preaching to be wanting in a groundwork of doctrine, and to Christians generally, so far as that kind of preaching fails to awaken their interest.

13. The First Exhortation. **Wherefore**—in consequence of all that has been said. **Gird up,** etc.—*having girded up.* As all who in ancient times were accustomed to wear long, flowing garments would of course tuck them up under their girdles when about to put forth extra effort, as running, so ought the readers—all others as well—to **gird up the loins of their mind**—that is, to be ever in a *state of preparation* for the future. **Be sober**—be in that state of circumspection and self-control which will keep you from falling under enticements to sin, to whatever part of your nature they may be addressed. The word was much used relative to wine drinking, but here it has a wider meaning. See 4: 7; 1 Thess. 5: 6. **And hope.** The Common Version conveys the impression that 'gird up,' 'be sober,' 'hope,' are co-ordinate, or equally emphatic. But the first two, in the Greek, are participles: *having girded, and being sober, hope.* In 'hope,' therefore, lies the main thought. Peter has been called the apostle of hope, and Paul the apostle of faith; but neither Peter's view of faith was deficient (1: 5, 21; 2: 7), nor Paul's view of hope (Rom. 8: 24; 5: 4, 5). **To the end**—an erroneous rendering. It should be, *perfectly*—*i. e.*, strongly and constantly, without intermittent doubting. **For the grace**—*upon the grace;* set your hope upon the grace, rest upon it—not upon the grace already given, but upon that ample and richer grace yet to be bestowed. Westcott and Hort, in their Greek Testament, connect 'perfectly' with 'be sober,' but the Revised Version connects it with 'hope.' The latter seems to be preferable; for 'hope' admits of degree more easily than 'sobriety.' **To be brought.** This does not refer merely to the future. The original participle is in the present tense; it is, *even now being brought.* Yet, as is often the case with

14 As obedient children, not fashioning yourselves according to the former lusts in your ignorance:
15 But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation;
16 Because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy.
17 And if ye call on the Father, who without respect

14 of Jesus Christ; as children of obedience, not fashioning yourselves according to your former
15 lusts in *the time of* your ignorance: but [1]like as he who called you is holy, be ye yourselves also holy
16 in all manner of living; because it is written, Ye
17 shall be holy; for I am holy. And if ye call on him as Father, who without respect of persons

1 Or, *like the Holy One who called you.*

the Greek present participle, the idea of the future is included. **Revelation of Jesus Christ**—the second coming of Christ. That the words imply belief that the second coming was near is held by a large number of expositors. See on 4: 7.

14-16. THE SECOND EXHORTATION; an exhortation to holiness.

14. As begins a new sentence. The ancient Hebrews sometimes expressed character, not by an adjective, as we are accustomed to do (a cursed man, an enlightened man, etc.), but by a noun, connecting with it another noun meaning *son* or *child*, thus: "children of transgression" (Isa. 57: 4); "children of iniquity" (Hos. 10: 9). This form is found in the Greek of the New Testament, and is called a Hebraism—*e. g.*, "children of light" (Eph. 5: 8); "children of wrath" (Eph. 2: 3); "children of curse"—*cursed children* (2 Pet. 2: 14); "children of disobedience" (Eph. 2: 2). So instead of **obedient children** (ver. 14) we have *children of obedience*. It is a more significant form of expression; for, as was natural in the Oriental imagination, those who are obedient are conceived as having obedience for their mother. (Winer § 34.) This poetic peculiarity is found in the Greek Classics, as well as in the New Testament. 'As' means, *as becomes*. **The former lusts**—not merely lascivious desires, but sinful desires of whatever kind. **Not fashioning yourselves.** Their former desires were the models according to which they fashioned (*formed*) themselves. **In your ignorance**—in the time of it, and in consequence of it. It was "ignorance of divine things" (Acts 17: 30; Eph. 4: 18; 1 Tim. 1: 13; Rom. 10: 3), and was held to be criminal. So far as the readers were Gentiles, they showed their ignorance through worship of idols; so far as they were Jews, they showed it by overlooking the exalted nature of him whom they professed to worship. According to the model of their former desires, they were not to fashion themselves. The Greek noun (σχῆμα—*scheme*) from which the verb is derived, expresses "the changing and transitory *fashion* of this world." (Dr. Schaff.)

15. A different translation of this is as follows: *But* [fashioning yourselves] *according to the Holy One who called you, be ye also holy*, etc. **Holy**—morally clean, separate from all moral impurity. It is a source of inexpressible joy that there is one Being in the universe who is not only infinitely holy, but is infinitely above the possibility of ever becoming unholy. The Holy One called them with "an effectual calling"—a powerful motive for being holy themselves. Conforming themselves to the Holy One is not only an outward act; it is also, and chiefly, an inward state. Holiness as a state of heart manifests itself in the external life. **Manner of conversation**—*manner of living*. **All.** No sinful form of life should be indulged.

16. Because—conclusive, and no reasoning can be more conclusive than that which is based upon the divine formula. **It is written.** See our Lord's use of it in Matt. 4: 4, 7, 10. Written in Lev. 11: 44; 19: 2, and many other places in the Old Testament. **Be ye holy**—ye *shall* be holy, according to another and approved reading. Neither the most exact conformity to moral law, nor the most scrupulous attention to the rites of Christianity, will answer in the place of holiness.

17-21. THE THIRD EXHORTATION, not the second expanded.

17. In fear—reverential sense of accountability, allied to holiness (vs. 15. 16), not precisely the same (2 Cor. 7: 1). See also 1 John 4: 18; Phil. 2: 12. **If**—not expressive of doubt, but a significant way of affirming. **Call on the Father.** The Revised Version has, *If ye call on him as Father*. If ye call on him in prayer, say some; but the meaning seems to be this: *If ye call him Father*—that is, If ye *surname* God Father. (See Crit. Notes.) *God* is the more comprehensive name of the Supreme Being; 'Father' is the less comprehensive; for, strictly, it can be used only

of persons judgeth according to every man's work, pass the time of your sojourning *here* in fear:
18 Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, *as* silver and gold, from your vain conversation *received* by tradition from your fathers;
19 But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot:

judgeth according to each man's work, pass the
18 time of your sojourning in fear: knowing that ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things, with silver or gold, from your vain manner of life
19 handed down from your fathers; but with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and
20 without spot, *even the blood* of Christ: who was

by those who become God's children by the begetting power of God's Spirit (1:3). By a very simple figure, therefore, 'Father' may be considered as God's *surname*, a name added to the more comprehensive name. Matt. 10:25 well illustrates the language used by our apostle: "If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his household?" In the true reading, the Greek verb is the same, and it is evident that Jesus is saying nothing about *invoking* either himself, or his disciples, or Beelzebub. If they *surnamed* (when his enemies did so we are not told, and it is of no importance) Jesus Beelzebub, how much more will they *surname* those who belong to him Beelzebub! If the Christians of Asia Minor call God Father, they ought to reverence him. That God is their Father is a reason why they should reverence him. Though a Father in his nature, he can be an impartial Judge. See Acts 17:31. Yet even in this life God is ever judging. **Work**—the inward, as well as the outward, life. **Pass the time of your sojourning in fear.** The readers are exhorted to a life of fear, not merely to a few distinct acts of fear.

18, 19. The exhortation is enforced by reference to the redemption effected by Christ. **Forasmuch as ye know**—*knowing*, assigns a reason, and the reason should act as a motive. **That ye were not redeemed,** etc. —therefore lead a life of fear—divine logic. **Silver and gold**—the second time Peter has alluded to gold. In ver. 7, it is "gold that perisheth"; here it is **corruptible.** "Silver and gold have I none," he said to the lame man. (Acts 3:6.) See also Acts 8:20: "May thy silver perish with thee." Farrar ("Early Days of Christianity") speaks too strongly, however, in asking his readers to "notice the Petrine *contempt* for dross." Translation according to the order of the Greek: *Knowing that not with perishable things, silver or gold, ye were redeemed from your empty* (fruitless) *manner of life derived from ancestors, but with precious blood, as of a lamb faultless and without blemish, Christ.* 'Redeemed'—not merely delivered, but delivered by the payment of something, a ransom. 'Derived from ancestors.' The basis was hereditary transmission of depravity, but probably the only reference here is to instruction and example. Such a manner of life was self-perpetuating. But they chose it and loved it. 'The precious blood'—not merely his death, but his blood. This is the ransom by which they were redeemed. (Heb. 9:22.) Christ's *life* is a ransom (Matt. 20:28); Christ himself is a ransom (Tit. 2:14). This the readers *know*. Their conviction of the fact is perfect, and such should be the conviction of the elect in all times. Christ is not the Saviour of men, unless men receive him as a ransom. **As of a lamb.** 'As' is not a comparison of Christ with a lamb. The translation given above shows that *Christ* is in apposition with *lamb*. Lamb designates Christ, not an animal. But why is Christ here called a lamb? Only or chiefly because he bore his sufferings with patience? Only because of his freedom from sin? ("Without blemish and without spot?"). He is likened to a lamb by Isaiah (53:7), and apparently for no other reason than that he was patient under suffering. But notice the connection in Isaiah: "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." (Ver. 6.) See also Ex. 12, relative to the paschal lamb, and John 1:29. Peter was so familiar with the idea of *sacrifice*, as illustrated in the death of the paschal lamb, that he must have used this word *lamb* to express not only innocence but substitution. See 2:24. **Without blemish and without spot**—*blameless and spotless*, suggested by Ex. 12:5. See our Epistle 2:22; Heb. 7:26. Few persons have the hardihood to deny that Jesus was sinless. In what harmony are Peter and Paul relative to the way of salvation! They are alike in agreeing that men can be saved only by the blood of Christ offered as a ransom. Compare Rom. 3:24, 25.

20. Still keeping his eye upon the duty of living in holy fear (ver. 17), the apostle reverts,

20 Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you,
21 Who by him do believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory; that your faith and hope might be in God.
22 Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, *see that ye* love one another with a pure heart fervently:

foreknown indeed before the foundation of the world, but was manifested at the end of the
21 times for your sake, who through him are believers in God, who raised him from the dead, and gave him glory; so that your faith and hope
22 might be in God. Seeing ye have purified your souls in your obedience to the truth unto unfeigned love of the brethren, love one another [1]from the

[1] Many ancient authorities read *from a clean heart.*

as in ver. 2, to the eternity past. Redemption was not the result of a change in the mind of God. **Foreordained.** The Greek means *foreknown*, as in ver. 2. Not merely as pre-existent was Christ foreknown, but as the Redeemer to come, and that before the **foundation,** or *creation*, of the world. (Eph. 1: 4.) **Verily,** *indeed* . . . **but.** Notice the contrast. **Manifest**—*was manifested.* **In these last times**—more correctly, after the approved reading, *in the last of the times;* from the first advent to the second. (Heb. 1: 2.) See on ver. 5, where "the last time" has a narrower sense. **For you**—*on your account, for your sake.*

21. Like Paul, Peter makes his thoughts roll on in successive clauses, like waves, sometimes seeming to repeat himself, but seldom doing so. Some say that he here gives the *aim* for which Christ was manifested—namely, to awaken within them faith in God; but perhaps he rather intended to *describe* those for whom he was manifested. **Who by him do believe in God.** Not that they believed *before* he came; but for those who believe not, believe not that God raised Christ from the dead and gave him glory, and persist in believing not, Christ cannot be said to have been manifested. In the general sense he appeared in the world for the good of all men; but with *efficacious, eternal results* only for those who believe. 'In God.' They are represented as believing in God, not as Creator, but as the Raiser of Christ from the dead, and as the Crowner of Christ with glory, which is substantially the same as to say that they believe in Christ. The latter is often represented as the *direct* object of faith (ver. 8; John 3: 16; 6: 40; yet see John 5: 24; 14: 1.) **Glory**—by bringing him to his right hand, and there making him the object of worship by angels and saints. (John 17: 5, 22; Eph. 1: 20-22.) **That your faith and hope,** etc. The clause expresses result, not design, thus: so that your faith and hope are *in* (*on*) God. Another translation is, So that your faith *is* (has become) also hope in God, which is probably incorrect. Peter's favorite idea, *hope*, is expressed the third time.

22. THE FOURTH EXHORTATION.

22. The first (ver. 13), *hope;* the second (ver. 15), *be holy;* the third (ver. 17), *fear;* the fourth (ver. 22), *love one another.* **Seeing ye have**—*having.* It is not a reason for loving one another, or a way of accounting for the obligation to do so. It expresses, not merely one past act of purifying, but a continuous act ever running parallel with that of loving one another. **Your souls.** The purifying is not external, a sense which the word sometimes has (John 11: 55; Acts 21: 24), but internal. **In obeying the truth**—*in obedience to the truth,* the truth being viewed as the element in which they are continually to purify their souls, not as the instrument by which. 'Truth' is the revelation made in the gospel. Faith, then, is not here overlooked by the apostle. 'In obeying'—*in your obedience.* See on the same word in ver. 2. Faith receives the truth and appropriates it; hence, obedience. **Through the Spirit.** As these words are not well supported by manuscript authority, they are rejected from the text. **Unto unfeigned love.** The preposition indicates the tendency. Inward purifying ever tends to create love toward the children of God. 'Unfeigned'—not manifested for a selfish end. (1 John 3: 18.) The hand and the tongue do not love, but neither do they fail to execute the heart's love. **See that ye**—not in the Greek, and unnecessarily inserted in the Common Version. **Love one another.** Peter is like John in spirit. "Let us love one another," says the latter in his First Epistle. This sweet word of exhortation may perhaps imply greater proportionate growth in Peter than in John. **With a pure heart**—with a heart morally clean. But the Greek word for pure

23 Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.

23 heart fervently: having been begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the
24 word of [1]God, which liveth and abideth. For,

1 Or, *God who liveth.*

καθαρᾶς, is wanting in so many manuscripts that it is rejected by many of the best critics. 'From the heart' is more correct. **Fervently.** The word means stretching toward, directed intensely toward the object—an important exhortation, lest they become cold and selfish.

23. Mutual love enforced. **Being born again**—or, better, *having been begotten again.* See ver. 3, where occurs the same Greek word, and where the Common Version is more correct than here. **Not of corruptible seed**—not according to natural law. (John 1: 13; 3: 4-6.) **But of incorruptible**—according to a supernatural law, begotten not by man, but by the Spirit of God, or by God himself. (John 1: 13; 3: 4-6.) **By the word of God.** Some wrongly regard 'the word of God' as the incorruptible seed. But they were begotten *of God*, 'of' indicating *the source* of their new life; but were begotten *by* (by means of) the *word* of God (James 1: 18), the truths of the Bible, the gospel. (1 Cor. 4: 15.) **Which liveth and abideth forever.** For the last word there is no corresponding Greek in the four oldest manuscripts. More literally, *by God's living and abiding word.* See Acts 7: 38, where 'life-giving oracles' refers to the commands, chiefly the moral law, given on Mount Sinai. But according to Paul (Rom. 8: 3; Gal. 3: 21), the law was weak, and could not give life. Yet the gospel may be strong and life-giving, even if the law is not so. Besides, the law is called *life-giving*, 'with reference not to its effect, but to its nature or design.' (Hackett on Acts 7: 38, "lively oracles.") But Peter speaks of the *effect* of the word. Paul and Peter, then, are still one, notwithstanding the effort of some to set them at variance. 'Liveth'—not inoperative, not unadapted to serve as means of bringing life to dead souls. The reasonings and exhortations of Plato's "Dialogue Against Atheism" and of his "Dialogue on the Soul's Immortality," though remarkable as productions of a Greek who had no knowledge of the Bible, might be preached in every possible variety of language, and not a human soul probably would thereby be regenerated. Abideth—not transient, but intended for all periods of time, never to be superseded by human philosophy. If the present *form* of the word—*i. e.*, as expressing the special intellectual traits of the several writers—will pass away at "the end," yet *the word of God* will remain. Compare Luke 21: 33. Thus even in heaven it will be our study, with whatever additional word God may there give us. In this life the *form* in which God's truth is enshrined must not be rejected under the pretense of retaining the truth in its spirit. A well-known lexicographer represents a *vase* as "rather for show than for use"; and this expresses the estimate which some put upon the written word. But the vase broken, the contents are lost—for him who breaks it.

A different explanation of 'the word of God which liveth and abideth,' has been given. Some connect 'liveth and abideth,' not with 'word,' but with 'God.' This requires the change of *which* into *who*, and we have, 'Of God who liveth and endureth.' The American Revisers suggested this rendering, and though it was not adopted, 'who liveth' stands in the margin of the English editions of the Revised Testament. In some other passages, prominence is given to the living and enduring nature of the *word.* Compare Heb. 4: 12; Acts 7: 38; Ps. 119: 89; Luke 21: 33. See also ver. 25: "The word of the Lord endureth forever." But there the original word is not the same, and strictly means *saying.*

24. This verse illustrates the nature of God's word by contrasting it with man. **For** assigns a reason: they have not been begotten by man, 'for' all flesh (*every man*), etc. **As grass**—is so transitory, therefore so weak, that he has no power to impart spiritual life. The words are quoted, with a little variation, from Isa. 40: 6, 8. Isaiah says, "All flesh is grass"; Peter says, 'as grass.' Isaiah says, "Our God"; Peter, 'the Lord.' The New Testament writers did not feel under obligation to make all their quotations with verbal exactness. They seem to quote sometimes from the Greek translation of the Hebrew, called the Septuagint, and sometimes they seem to quote from memory, and

24 For all flesh *is* as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away:
25 But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.

All flesh is as grass,
And all the glory thereof as the flower of grass.
The grass withereth, and the flower falleth:
25 But the [1] word of the Lord abideth for ever.
And this is the [1] word of good tidings which was preached unto you.

1 Gr. *saying.*

when quoting from memory, they may have in mind the Septuagint, or the Hebrew itself. Their variations from the Hebrew need not cause difficulty; and the student of the Bible should reverentially abstain from acting as censor of the evangelists, and apostles, and of Christ for the variations in question, till he understands much better than any man has yet understood the relation of the free working of the human mind to the free working of the Divine Spirit. **All the glory**—whatever man, in his unrenewed state, regards as specially adapted to promote his own honor, as wisdom, power, riches. (Jer. 9: 23; James 1: 11.) **Withereth and falleth.** The original form of the verb expresses *habitualness.* The grass is accustomed to wither, and the flower is accustomed to fall. Or it may express the necessity and universality of the fact. Grass necessarily or universally withereth, etc. Compare Matt. 6: 29, 30. See Crit. Notes.

25. The word which by the gospel—better, as in the Revised Version, *the word of good tidings which was preached.* The Being referred to in John 1: 1 (the Word, the Logos) is not meant here. Peter alludes much to the Old Testament, but only as it sheds its light upon the coming of the Messiah. He and the other apostles used it, not for Jewish, but for Christian ends. **Preached unto you**—by Paul and others, so that you heard it, and by means of it were begotten to the new life. Thus is enforced the duty of mutual love.

CRITICAL NOTES.—CHAPTER I.

8. *Knowing* (εἰδότες) is rejected from the Greek for *seeing* (ἰδόντες). (Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort.) Huther, however, in Meyer, says that both words give a suitable meaning; and that as both are sustained by weighty authorities, it cannot be decided which is the original. Bengel and Huther prefer 'knowing' (εἰδότες). On rhetorical ground (variety) one might prefer the former; for then in the first clause the readers would be spoken of as not *knowing* Christ (personally), and in the second as not *seeing* him; but the result is the same in either case. The evidence has increased in favor of the word expressive of sight.

17. If ye *call on (invoke, pray to) the Father.* ἐπικαλεῖσθε is held by some as having this sense; this is its meaning in Acts 7: 59; Rom. 10: 12, 13, 14, and many other places. ἐκάλεσαν (*have called*), the same verb without the preposition ἐπι (*on*) in Matt. 10: 25, is rejected by the best critics for ἐπεκάλεσαν, which cannot there mean to *call on*—that is, to invoke or pray to, but *to call* a name *upon.* The preposition both there and here implies the addition of a name to another name. It need not be translated "surname," but that word very well expresses the thought. The Son of Mary bore the name of Jesus, and his enemies added the name Beelzebub. So to the name *God* is *added* the name *Father.* On the passage in Matthew, see Meyer, and especially Buttmann, p. 151, *note.* Trench ("Authorized Version"): "Here, too, it must be confessed that we have left a better, and chosen a worse, rendering. The Geneva had it, 'And if ye call him Father, who,' etc.; and this, and this only, is the meaning which the words of the original . . . will bear." Hackett on Acts 15: 17: *Upon whom my name has been called*—i. e., given, applied to them as a sign of their relationship to God. See James 2: 7. (Do they not blaspheme *that worthy name by the which ye are called* ἐπικληθὲν)?

24. ἐξηράνθη (*withereth*) and ἐξέπεσε (*falleth*) are indeed aorists, a tense which, in itself, generally expresses a past, completed act. Winer insists that even here this sense should be adhered to (*withered, fell*), but Buttmann says that the aorist sometimes expresses what is habitual, and "just as well and still more frequently the necessity or universality of an action or state." The gnomic aorist, as it is called, has the sense of the present. See Thayer's edition, p. 201, 1876.

In our study of the chapter, it has been seen that, after an argumentative, doctrinal introduction, ver. 13 begins a series of exhort-

CHAPTER II.

WHEREFORE laying aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil speakings,
2 As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby:

1 Putting away therefore all [1] wickedness, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil speakings,
2 as newborn babes, long for the [2] spiritual milk which is without guile, that ye may grow thereby

1 Or, *malice*.....2 Gr. *belonging to the reason.*

utions. Of these four have been given. The chapter is one of exceeding richness, and its doctrines and exhortations are as well adapted to Christians of the present time as to those of the apostolic age. The student should not fail to see it as a striking and beautiful portrait of Peter, not merely as "converted" (*turned*) after his terrible denial of Christ, but as one who had grown much "in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." (2 Pet. 3: 18, Rev. Ver.)

Ch. II: 1-10. Fifth Exhortation: *Desire the sincere milk of the word.*

1. Wherefore points to the ground on which the exhortation rests. You have been born by means of the word (1: 23); therefore desire the word. You have been exhorted to mutual love (1: 22), the child of that new birth which was effected by means of the word, and this implies obligation to lay aside all malice, etc.; therefore desire the word. Laying aside malice, etc., is to run continually parallel with desiring the word. **Laying aside**—*putting off*. It was at first applied to putting off something external, as a crown or a garment, and therefore this is a figurative use of the word. The use of the figure was not intended to teach that the sins mentioned are only external. **Evil speaking**—speaking against a person, backbiting (2 Cor. 12: 20), and so far as they take on words, all other sins are but molds into which the hot passions of the heart are poured. (Matt. 15: 18, 19.) **Malice** (*wickedness* in the Revised Version), **guile, hypocrisies**, and **envies**—too far from being strangers in the hearts of most men to make explanation necessary. So common were these forms of sin in the ancient world, both Jewish and Gentile, that Christ and the apostles gave them no quarter, whatever mercy they showed to the penitent who had been guilty of them. See Matt. 5: 22, 44; 12: 36; 15: 19, 20; Rom. 1: 28-30; Gal. 5: 19-21. To 'lay aside' is the duty of Christians, which implies repentance; to repent is the duty of others, which implies laying aside. The former, addressed to men while impenitent, might lead to a course of self-righteousness.

2, 3. As—as new-born babes are wont to do. **New-born babes.** 'Babes' is here not used in contrast with adults (full age), as in Heb. 5: 13, 14; it is not expressive of special weakness of character, as in 1 Cor. 3: 1; Heb. 5: 13; does not necessarily refer to "those just entering on the Christian life." (Robinson.) The Epistle contains no evidence that the readers had but recently been born again; it contains proof to the contrary. Not 'new-born babes,' but 'desire,' etc., is expressive of Christian character as it should be maintained to the end of life. **Desire**—*long for*. **The sincere milk of the word**—much quoted, but a poor representative of the original. The Greek for 'word,' instead of being a noun, is an adjective, the same as is found in Rom. 12: 1, and there rendered *reasonable*—that is, pertaining to your rational or spiritual part. So here the milk for which the readers are to long is such milk as pertains to their spiritual nature—spiritual milk. 'Sincere' is not a fitting word to describe the quality of *milk;* rather, *without guile, pure, unadulterated.* Long for the spiritual, pure milk; by milk is meant *the word of God.* That word, pure, unmixed with error, spiritual, is the proper nourishment for regenerate souls. For that nourishment we are exhorted to long. As the new-born babe turns with instinctive earnestness to its mother for nourishment, so should all Christians most earnestly desire the word of God. In respect to this longing for God's word, we are to be babes, however old we may be. **Thereby**—not *by means of*, but *in* (ἐν) it; grow in the power of it, grow in the spiritual power which it will minister. **That ye may grow**—the *end* for which they should receive into their souls the word of God. The word may be desired as a means of usefulness, but it is right that one's own growth be the chief end. Not "work and grow," but "study and grow," is the divine direction. Nourish

3 If so be ye have tasted that the Lord *is* gracious.
4 To whom coming, *as unto* a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, *and* precious,

3 unto salvation; if ye have tasted that the Lord is
4 gracious: unto whom coming, a living stone, rejected indeed of men, but with God elect, [1]precious,

1 Or, *honorable*.

your new life with the truth of God's word, or your working will be the child of self-conceit. A blustering and egotistic working shows that the worker needs more milk of the word. "Work and grow" is one of those maxims which has some truth, but much error. See Crit. Notes. **If so be**—'if,' but, as in 1: 17, not a sign of doubt. **Ye have tasted**—*ye tasted*—namely, at your conversion. If ye tasted, as I doubt not you did, that the Lord is *gracious* (*good*), long for the spiritual, pure milk of the word. "Taste and see that the Lord is good." (Ps. 34: 8.) In the Hebrew, *Lord* is *Jehovah*, yet Peter does not hesitate to apply it to Christ. 'Tasted.' Compare Heb. 6: 4: "And have *tasted of* the heavenly gift." It is not merely *sipped*, as understood by many Christian people, but it expresses inward experience or enjoyment, very full, possibly. In the New Testament the verb is found in connection with death (Matt. 16: 28; Mark 9: 1), and, of course, cannot mean that the experience of death was slight. Tasting death is full experience of death. So here, to 'taste,' etc., is to have inward experience of the Lord's graciousness. Sipping is quite too common; it makes one weak and thin.

4. The new exhortation (*desire*) and the end (*growth*), lead the apostle to a vivid description of the gracious Lord, and of themselves, as subjects of the new birth. This will quicken their desire and promote their growth. **To whom**—the Lord—*i. e.*, Christ. **Coming**—by faith—*i. e.*, *believing*. Not, *having first come*, and after that *built up a spiritual house* (ver. 5); but the two are to run on together during the earthly life; ever coming and ever built up. Some came to Christ only with the feet; some come only with the head. The coming must be that of the heart; and such coming implies the coming of the entire man. **A living stone.** That the figure was suggested to Peter by his own name (Petros, *rock*) is improbable. He comes to the use of the figure more directly; he comes to it through his familiarity with the Old Testament. The verse is tinged with language drawn from Ps. 118: 22; Isa. 28: 16, yet the words are not a quotation. The severest taste need not be offended at the application of the term 'living' to 'stone.' Christ is life—is the Giver of life. As bread he is the same. (John 6: 51.) Not even while held by the "great stone" of Joseph's tomb (Matt. 27: 60), was he other than a living stone. **Living**—a little key for unlocking great treasures—a living *hope* (1: 3); the living *word* (1: 23); and now a living *stone*. **Disallowed indeed of men**—*rejected* after being tried. **Chosen.** See on 'elect' (1: 2), and compare 2: 9. Christ was chosen as the Messiah—chosen to his redeeming work and to all its blessed results. (Isa. 42.) Contrast Peter's quiet positiveness of conviction with the exasperated infidelity of the rulers expressed too weakly in that skeptical and semi-hypocritical *if:* "If he be Christ, the chosen of God." (Luke 23: 35.) **Precious**—*honorable*, and honorable because precious; costly. (Matt. 3: 17; Heb. 1: 3, 6, 9; Col. 1: 13.) How the golden music of Peter's word revives the spirit when fainting under earthly fatigues, or when longing for some new consciousness of spiritual life! **Chosen of God**—*elect with God*. It is infinite capacity which so appreciates the excellence of the living stone. How marked the contrast which the apostle makes between God's estimate and man's! Rejected by men! The rejection was foretold by Christ himself (Mark 8: 31); and the severest rebuke of himself which ever fell upon the ear of Peter from the lips of Christ, "Get thee behind me, Satan!" was administered because of his hasty and unseemly "rebuke" of his Master, when the latter announced the certainty of the very event of which Peter now speaks. "The Son of man must be rejected." Peter sees with the utmost clearness that this was to be; and in the blessed consequences resulting, he rejoices. It was indeed love, but love with blurred vision, which prompted the original utterance. His sight was long ago made clear. At a later period of his ministry, Christ spoke of himself as rejected *by this generation* (Luke 17: 25). Isaiah says, Rejected of *men;* and this was the great and fearful fact, that so far as it

5 Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.
6 Wherefore also it is contained in the Scripture,

5 ye also, as living stones, are built up, [1]a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.
6 Because it is contained in [2]scripture,

1 Or, *a spiritual house for a holy priesthood*.....2 Or, *a scripture*.

knew him the human *race* rejected him—the exceptions were very few. Among the saddest representations of art is that of "Christ Rejected."

5. Ye . . . are built up. Many take the verb as imperative, instead of indicative: Be ye yourselves also built up. The apostle is still filled with the thought of their growth. Not, Be living stones, but be built up **as living stones.** He thinks of them both as individuals, and as individuals connected with each other. He is not thinking of them as organized bodies; for there were many churches there, and he represents them as growing into *one* building. The picture is exceedingly graphic. "Look unto the rock whence ye are hewn." (Isa. 51:1.) Once dead stones in the quarry, now living stones! But the building of which they form a part has this peculiarity, that it is capable of indefinite growth. He does not yet say that the living stone, Christ, is a corner-stone, and that it is that upon which they are to be built. Perhaps the conception is in his mind; for he soon gives utterance to the thought. **A spiritual house**—not the foundation, or even a part of it. See on corner-stone in the next verse. To be built up as a mere house, however large and elaborate—as the Roman Catholic Church, for example, and even some Protestant (National) Churches, is foreign to Peter's view. **Spiritual**—because, being begotten by God (1:3), they may ever become more like the children of God—*i. e.*, more holy. (1:15, 16.) **A holy priesthood.** In many valuable manuscripts, a preposition (εἰς *into*) stands before these words. Be built up a spiritual house *into*—i. e., for the purpose of becoming a holy priesthood. If 'house' is used for *temple*, the transition to *priesthood* was easy. Becoming a body of holy priests was *the end* to which becoming a temple looked. They were to be not only stones, but living stones; not only living stones constituting a temple, but, with greater boldness of view, this temple itself was to become a community of priests, and that community was to be a *holy* one. The Jewish priest was accustomed to draw especially near to God to offer sacrifice and incense for others, as well as for himself; and thus he was supposed to be set apart from others. (Num. 16:5; Exod. 19:22.) So these Christians are all alike to be holy, and all alike to draw near to God. No one is to be a priest in any higher sense than another. *Priest*—applied officially under the Christian economy to ministers of the gospel, as has been done many centuries by several ecclesiastical bodies, is not in harmony with the spirit of this passage. *Altar* has been applied, unscripturally, to a given part of a *Christian* house of worship, and even *sacrifice* to the ministration of the Lord's Supper. Bad seed—bad fruit. Jewish terms with a Jewish meaning, instead of Jewish terms with a Christian meaning, well nigh ruined Christendom. All Christians are now priests, and ought to be as holy as the priests of ancient Israel were supposed to be.

But this great community of priests is made such, in order to **offer up spiritual sacrifices.** The Jewish sacrifices ought always to have been offered with spiritual feeling, but not often were they so offered; and had they been so offered, they were in themselves material, animal. (Heb. 9:10, 13, 22.) 'Spiritual'—offered with the spirit, and not of a material nature. Offering one's self (Rom. 12:1), praise (Heb. 13:15), and doing good, almsgiving (Rom 15:16), are included in spiritual sacrifices **Acceptable to God.** See Rom. 15:16; 12:1; 14:18. Such sacrifices, and the offering of them, are well pleasing to God. **By Jesus Christ.** Some say, well pleasing *through Christ;* others, *to offer up through Christ.* The former seems preferable. Thrilling to every child of God is the efficacy of that mediation by which sacrifices, so worthless in themselves, are made pleasing to Him who is infinitely pure.

6. Wherefore—*for*, or *because*. **Also** has little manuscript authority. The apostle proves what he has said by quoting from Isa. 28:16. But parts of Isaiah's description are left out. Compare the two. **In Sion.** 'Sion' (*Zion*) was the southwestern hill on which

Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded.

7 Unto you therefore which believe *he is* precious: but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner,

Behold, I lay in Zion a chief corner stone, elect,
[1] precious:
And he that believeth on [2] him shall not be put to shame.

7 [3] For you therefore who believe is the [4] preciousness:
but for such as disbelieve,
The stone which the builders rejected,
The same was made the head of the corner;

1 Or, *honorable*.....2 Or, *it*.....3 Or, *In your sight*.....4 Or,

Jerusalem was built, and was sometimes used for the entire city. Being the residence of the kings, and (Ps. 132: 13) the "habitation" of Jehovah, it was the seat of divine and of human government. There God laid the chief corner-stone of the Jewish theocracy, or of the house of David. The words express, therefore, stability of Jewish government; but reference to the Messiah is clear, in which nearly all expositors are agreed. **A chief corner-stone**—not a *chief* corner-stone, but a stone laid at the *extreme angle*—that is, a *corner-stone*. The context shows that it was to be a *foundation* corner-stone, and this is distinctly said by Isaiah. Such a stone supports all that is above it. It binds together the two sides; but this idea, on which some like to linger, is not expressed either here, or in Isaiah. Hence the pleasing and Scriptural fact that Jews and Gentiles are bound together by a common union with Christ is put into Peter's words, not drawn out of them. See Eph. 2: 20, where the readers are said to be built on the apostles and prophets, as well as on Christ. Christians in general are not a part of the foundation; and this is a fact of very great importance. That they are a part of it is a conception foreign to the New Testament, and is a fruitful source of error. The words in 1 Tim. 3: 15 do not teach the contrary. That the apostles, in connection with Christ, are a part of the foundation, Christ as the corner-stone, "the first and chief part," indeed, shows that their teachings are authoritative, and authoritative because they are the voice of Christ in them. Christ and the apostles deliver truth; we receive it. See Bernard's "Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament." p. 125, and elsewhere. **Elect, precious.** See on the same words in ver. 4. **Believeth on him.** The preposition implies *resting upon him*. See on 1: 8. **Shall not be confounded**—*be put to shame* (Rom. 5: 5); that is, shall receive the end for which his faith is placed upon Christ—*final glory*.

7. **Unto you therefore which believe he is precious.** To millions of the elect, accustomed to read only the English, this is one of the richest things in the Epistle, and to reject it as not the true expression of the mind of the Spirit will seem like the ruthless crushing of a diamond. Yet it is the duty of all to sit reverently at the feet of the Divine Teacher, and to receive all that may there be taught. To the believer, the preciousness of Christ will not be lost, or in the least diminished, even if it is not taught directly in the words before us. **Therefore**—in view of what I have said relative to the living stone. Therefore to you who *believe*, who rely upon the stone as the true foundation, is '*the honour*.' See margin of Revised Version. The word *honour* stands in contrast with the idea implied in *shall not be put to shame*. (Ver. 6.) See Crit. Notes. It is there implied that he who believeth not shall be *dishonored*. It also stands in contrast with what follows. Thus the contrast is twofold: (*a*) He that believes not shall be dishonored; to you, on the contrary, who believe, is the honor. (*b*) To you who believe is the honor; they, on the other hand, who believe not, stumble against the stone, and so are dishonored. The apostle speaks of the *reward* which is conferred upon believers, not of what Christ is to them; though precious he most certainly is.

Them which be disobedient—better, both in style and thought, as in the Revised Version, *such as disbelieve*. The critics adopt the Greek word for *disbelieving* (ἀπιστοῦσιν), instead of that for *the disobedient* (ἀπειθοῦσι). The unbelief is active, and more or less hostile. Thus are contrasted the faith of Christians and the disbelief of others. **Which the builders disallowed** (or *rejected*)—which the working religionists, the Scribes and Pharisees, who were very busy, and thought themselves very skillful in building a spiritual house, *rejected*. Their own Scriptures (ver. 6) proved that the building would be useless, unless God's stone were used; but they not only did not want it—they rejected it. **The**

8 And a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, *even to them* which stumble at the word, being disobedient: whereunto also they were appointed.
9 But ye *are* a chosen generation, a royal priesthood,

8 and,
A stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence;
[1] for they [2] stumble at the word, being disobedient:
9 whereunto also they were appointed. But ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a

1 Gr. *who*.....2 Or. *stumble, being disobedient to the word*

same—*this*. It is a case not of mere repetition (*the stone . . . the same*), but of emphasis, *this very* stone which the builders rejected. To a consciously condemned builder the use of the word was like thrusting the blade to the hilt. Peter quotes from Ps. 118: 22. Of what egregious folly and sin were the builders guilty! Compare Matt. 7: 24–27, and note especially our Lord's own solemn citation of the passage, in presence of the very men to whom it was applicable. (Matt. 21: 42.) **Is made**—*has become*, implying that he continues to be the head of the corner. What the builders rejected as a *stone* unfit to be used in the building at all, God caused to become, by the resurrection and glorification, the *corner*-stone. See Crit. Notes.

8. And . . . offence. 'Offence' recalls the solemn application of the same word (σκάνδαλον) to Peter himself, when he rebuked his Master. (Matt. 16: 23.) He came to the right view by severity, administered in wonderful love. The Greek word is originally "a *trap-stick*—a bent stick on which the bait is fastened, which the animal strikes against, and so springs the trap." (Robinson.) Hence, it came to mean a *trap*, and was at length easily applied to whatever was the cause of one's falling morally. Peter quotes from Isa. 8: 14. Christ rejected became ruin to the rejecters. The rejecters brought ruin on themselves; but in that ruin must not be overlooked the active and just displeasure of God. See Luke 10: [illegible]; 2: 34; 20: 18. **Even to them** was unnecessarily supplied, and even the Revisers supply 'for.' Literally, *who stumble at the word, being disobedient;* or (as in the margin of the Revised Version), *stumble, being disobedient to the word.* They are not represented as stumbling both at Christ and the word. They stumble at that word which has respect to redemption by Christ as the only ground of salvation. See 1 Cor. 1: 18, and especially 1: 23, of the same Epistle. Preaching Christ as less than the corner-stone of all durable human hopes is perilous work. It saves none, and ruins all who like it. **Whereunto**—*to which* stumbling, not to which disobedience. In the original, 'stumble' is a verb, and 'being disobedient' is a participle. The main thought is expressed in the verb, and it is the main thought to which 'whereunto' should be referred. **Appointed.** The Greek is the same as is found in 1 Thess. 5: 9: "For God hath not *appointed* us to wrath." They are unbelieving, which is a sin; they stumble, and though that also is a sin, yet it is here viewed as a punishment of the unbelief, and in this respect God appointed them to it. That one who persistently refuses to believe in Jesus Christ may be appointed by God, after "much long-suffering," to the ruin which is implied in stumbling, is an obvious principle of his moral government, and is recognized as such with remarkable calmness and independence by the sacred writers. See the very important words in Rom. 9: 22. The appointing was before the stumbling, for the verb is in a past tense. There is a power back of the devil's.

9. Another description of the readers and equally of all the regenerate, the more striking in contrast with that of the unbelieving just given. It is an additional evidence of Peter's knowledge of the Old Testament, for nearly every item is Scriptural in language as well as in thought. **A chosen generation,** *an elect race.* (Isa. 43: 20; Deut. 7: 6; Isa. 45: 4.) The original for *chosen* is here used the fourth time since the Epistle opened. The word bristles with no such difficulties that one need fear to use it often. Applied at first to Israel as a race chosen by God from all other nations, it is here applied to all Christians. These have been chosen out of the world to eternal life. **A royal priesthood.** See Ex. 19: 6, where it is "a kingdom of priests." Peter's form is according to the Septuagint. The delicate pencil of John has given us a similar picture (Rev. 1: 6; 5: 10) in a different form; "kings and priests" in the Common Version, which Keil and Delitzsch ("Pentateuch") affirm to be in the Greek the correct reading. But the correct reading gives us *a kingdom, priests.* See the "Commentary on the Revela-

a holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light:
10 Which in time past *were* not a people, but *are* now

people for *God's* own possession, that ye may shew forth the excellencies of him who called you out of
10 darkness into his marvellous light: who in time past were no people, but now are the people of

tion" (this series), by Justin A. Smith, D. D. On 1: 6, Dr. Smith says: "The correct rendering of the Greek in the word we here distinguish is important. A less ambiguous translation would be, *made us to be a kingdom*—that is, made a kingdom *of* us, not *for* us. Believers are spoken of collectively as a 'kingdom,' in the sense in which that word is so often used in the New Testament, not individually as 'kings.' The word 'priests' applies to them individually, as well as collectively, and has reference to the abolishing of that ancient ritual, in which approach to God must be always with priestly intervention." All Christians are priests. They are a kingdom. Their priesthood has royalty. **A holy nation.** (Ex. 19: 6.) See on 1: 15, 16. **A peculiar people.** (Deut. 7: 6; 14: 2.) 'Peculiar' is not here equivalent to *odd* (*oddity* may be a blotch on character), but to *owned as property, belonging to;* and this is doubtless the sense in which King James' Revisers used the word, *peculiar* being derived from the Latin word *peculium* (property). The Greek is, literally, *a people for a possession*—that is, *designed for* a possession. For *special* possession (Farrar, "Early Days"); for *God's own* possession. (Revised Version.) Israel was acquired by Jehovah for his possession; in no such exalted sense was any other nation his property. So the readers of the Epistle, so all Christians, are God's possession, acquired through the redeeming work of Christ (Tit. 2: 14), and in this sense the unregenerate are not God's possession. See Eph. 1: 14; Acts 20: 28; Isa. 43: 21.

This vivid description must not be weakened by the supposition that it is merely ideal. It describes what Christians are now, not what they will be either in the millennium or in heaven. So far as men are not what this description makes them, they are without evidence that they have been born again. Introduction of persons into Christian churches in infancy has done much to make the description inapplicable; so also has hasty reception of adults professing to believe. The character of Christians as here given is so exalted that, if it is not realized in a community which rejects infant church-membership, superficiality in preaching and method of working may justly be presumed. **That** (denoting design) **ye should shew forth,** etc., by publishing wide. **The praises**—*virtues* (the meaning of the Greek), as applied to God, is very uncommon. The singular is used in 2 Pet. 1: 3, and that also is applied to God. Though *holiness* is the term almost always used in the Scriptures for the purpose of expressing God's moral nature, and though *virtus* (virtue) was used by the Romans to express, chiefly, mere natural bravery, yet we need not be so surprised as some are (Farrar and Dr. Edwin A. Abbott) at the application of the word, either singular or plural, to the Divine Being. Here it may be rendered, as in the Revised Version, *excellencies.* See Isa. 43: 21. **Who hath called**—*who called you* is more exact; called at the time of your conversion. It was God's effective calling through the Holy Spirit. **Out of darkness**—darkness of sin and ignorance, leading always to misery. (Col. 1: 13.) Nothing in the material universe more expressively symbolizes the state of the unrenewed mind. 'Out of.' Yet the darkness is not external. **His light.** The natural light represents the ineffable light of God's life. Compare John 1: 4. **Marvellous**—in itself, and to angels and saints. Darkness! light! Out of! into! The greatest change expressed in the smallest words.

10. Which (*who*) **in time past,** etc. See Hos. 1: 9, 10; 2: 23. Speaking of the state of Israel at the time when he was writing, the prophet says substantially this: They are not God's people; God has no mercy for them, so thoroughly have they forsaken the Lord; but the time will come, the time of the Messiah, when they will become God's people, and will be the object of God's compassion. Peter applied this to the readers. They, too, were once not a people. He does not say, not the people *of God;* but he says, **not a people.** See Crit. Notes. They were not even a people, so wanting were they in oneness of characteristics. Sin disunites and scatters. As several interpreters express it, they were a *not-people;* humiliating, but true. He speaks of them as individuals, and as a community. But the disunited and scattered ones, brought together

the people of God: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy.
11 Dearly beloved, I beseech *you* as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul;
12 Having your conversation honest among the Gen-

God: who had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy.
11 Beloved, I beseech you as sojourners and pilgrims, to abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the
12 soul; having your behaviour seemly among the Gen-

by the spiritual change which each has received through the ransom paid by Christ, are now a people, and more—they are God's people. It is equally true that once they "were in the condition of those that have received no mercy; but now ye did receive mercy." (Lillie.) The public prayers of the German missionary, Dr. J. G. Oncken, offered during his visit to this country, were characterized by the outpouring of fervent praise for the amazing change which grace had wrought upon the Christians present. Peter is here virtually exhorting the saints of Asia Minor to extol the grace which wrought a similar change upon themselves.

Ch. 2: 11—4: 6. Second Series of Exhortations.

This series, speaking generally, pertains to relations to the world without; embracing particularly, relation to (*a*) rulers; (*b*) masters; (*c*) husbands; (*d*) wives; (*e*) persecutors—a classification which must be taken as only in part correct, for the thoughts of the several divisions are not a little intermingled; and in the exhortations to husbands, both the husbands and the wives are supposed to be members of the church.

11, 12. Preliminary General Exhortations. **Dearly beloved.** *Beloved* is more correct; and such everywhere else in Peter's Epistles is the rendering. Very tender is the address, more like the nature of John than of Peter; but Peter's nature has been overmatched by grace. **I beseech** (*you*); tenderness still, not prelatical lordliness; real, not assumed for effect, which is possible along with great arrogance of power. **As strangers and pilgrims**—*as being* such, *as those who know* that they are such. As to the former word, see on 1: 1. The two Greek words, which here have a figurative meaning, are used in nearly the same sense—that of *sojourners* in the world, having no right of citizenship, not permanent residents. **Fleshly lusts.** Compare the exhortation in 1: 14; 2: 1, and see similar forms of expression in Gal. 5: 16; Eph. 2: 3; 2 Pet. 2: 18. 'Lusts'—sinful desires in general, including, doubtless, *uncleanness* or *impurity*, then so painfully common in all classes of society, from the lowest to the highest (so painfully common now), that the pure, in the sense to which Peter refers, were, probably, exceptions. 'Fleshly'—*carnal;* so called because they proceed from our corrupt nature. It is a figurative use of the word. The flesh was indeed conceived as in some sense the occasion of wrong desires, but strictly the desires are desires of the soul, not of the material nature; and fleshly desires are desires of the soul viewed as unregenerate. The readers are a holy nation (ver. 9), but they have not become superior to the necessity of exhortation. **Abstain**—literally, *hold yourselves off from.* This I exhort you to do as persons who are not citizens of this world, who belong to a commonwealth which is in heaven (Phil. 3: 20); a motive the strength of which can be *felt* only by those who are *sojourners.* **Which war.** This military term is used also by James (4: 1), and by Paul (Rom. 7: 23), *warring against.* Sinful desires are not a besieging army waiting for surrender, but are foes of merciless activity. **Against the soul.** If sinful desires are desires of the soul, how can they be said to war against the soul? They are viewed by the apostle as having their seat outside the soul—that is, in the flesh; and the soul is viewed as the immortal, spiritual part of man. It was possible for the readers to relapse, and the apostle's exhortation is to be a means of keeping them. Several hundred years before Peter's time, a Greek philosopher, who had no written revelation, wrote of an *immortal battle* between right and wrong.[1] The "grandeur" of the conception is second only to that of the Scripture.

Verse 12 enforces the exhortation of ver. 11 by the consideration that God may come to be glorified by the Gentiles, who shall have been converted through the influence of their holy walk. **Conversation**—*course of life.* (1: 15, 18.) **Honest**—literally, *beautiful.* It is not, *beautiful course of life*, which might, perhaps,

[1] Plato, "Against the Atheists." See Lewis' ed., 1845, p. 68, line 12.

tiles: that, whereas they speak against you as evil doers, they may by *your* good works, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation.

13 Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme;

tiles: that, wherein they speak against you as evil-doers, they may by your good works, which they behold, glorify God in the day of visitation.

13 Be subject to every [1]ordinance of man for the

1 Gr. *creation.*

refer only to a *day's* course of life, or a week's, but it is, having *your course of life* beautiful, which can mean nothing less than that their entire course of life must be beautiful. The Revised Version renders *seemly*, but it renders the same word in the latter part of the verse, *good*. A life may be beautiful in the sense in which the word was used by ancient Greek philosophy, without being morally good. The life enjoined by Peter is far better than the beautiful life extolled by the Greeks. **Gentiles,** living under the Roman government, were the most numerous of the inhabitants living in the region to which the Epistle was sent. The form of the allusion to Gentiles is one of the grounds for supposing that the majority of the readers were Jews. Christianity raises no impenetrable barrier between the regenerate and the men of the world (consider the necessary relations of the two classes in business and social life), but it is justly inexorable in its demand that the lives of the former shall in no degree be modeled by the principles of the latter. The principles which underlie the business, politics, and pleasures of the world, are too corrupt to be used by men of heavenly birth. Spiritual alliance with God, and acting upon such principles, are as impossible as for "the fountain" to "send forth from the same opening sweet water and bitter." (James 3: 11, Rev. Ver.) Professions of such alliance, while acting upon such principles, are worthless, and the sooner either the principles or the professions are renounced, the better. **That whereas,** etc. *So that, in what they speak against you as evildoers, they, when beholding, may,* etc. **As** *as being,* **evil doers.** The Christians were slandered by the unconverted Gentiles. They were misunderstood. "If in hot climates the long absence of rain brought on a drought; if in Egypt the Nile failed to irrigate the fields; if in Rome the Tiber overflowed its banks; if a contagious disease was raging; if an earthquake, a famine, or any other public calamity occurred, the popular rage was easily turned against the Christians." (Neander.) According to the same historian, Augustine reports that it became a proverb in North Africa, "If there is no rain, tax it on the Christians." Though referring to a later time, the proverb throws light upon the words of Peter. If the readers lead a life of holiness ("good works") before their slanderers, these will be so changed that in the very same things in which they misunderstand and malign them, they will at length be led to praise God. **Behold**—a strong word, one which implies sharp observation and contemplation; not mere seeing, for which the Greek has another word. **Day of visitation.** In Job 10: 12, and Luke 19: 44, these words are used to express God's favor; in Isa. 10: 3, and many other places, God's displeasure. Should God have mercy upon their slanderers, they will praise him for that in you of which they now speak so unjustly. If the words are used in the latter sense, the slanderers are represented as the unwilling means of glorifying God when the day of punishment comes.

13, 14. FIRST EXHORTATION (*particular*). The general exhortation of ver. 11, enforced in ver. 12, is now resolved into particulars. First: *Submission to the civil power.* **Submit yourselves**—so some translate; others, *be subject.* The submission must be voluntary, not yielded with reluctance. See Crit. Notes. **To every ordinance of man**—*to every human institution*—that is, every institution originating with men; a comprehensive direction applicable to the citizen, the servant (ver. 18), and to the wife (3: 1). Applied to the citizen, it requires him to render obedience to the civil power. It was possible that some of the Christians might be "contentiously conscientious." They might refuse to do what it would not be sinful to do. Such instances are known to have occurred. See Neander, "Church History." Such superfluity of conscientiousness it was important to prevent, lest the charge of being evil doers should be just. It was not necessary for Peter's purpose to remind them of the possible existence of such civil requirements as it would be sinful to obey. His opinion concerning that point may be seen in Acts 4: 18-20. His present silence is

14 Or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by
him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the
praise of them that do well.
15 For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye
may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men:
16 As free, and not using *your* liberty for a cloak of
maliciousness, but as the servants of God.

Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme;
14 or unto governors, as sent [1] by him for vengeance
on evil-doers and for praise to them that do well.
15 For so is the will of God, that by well-doing ye
should put to silence the ignorance of foolish men:
16 as free, and not [2] using your freedom for a cloak of
17 [3] wickedness, but as bondservants of God. Honour

1 Gr. *through*.....2 Gr. *having*.....3 Or, *malice*.

not the result of greater conservatism. He is older, indeed, but he has as much natural courage as ever, and a good deal more grace. If by submitting to every ordinance of man he meant submitting even if it involved commission of sin, why did he not save himself from martyrdom? Compare Paul's view in the very important passages, Rom. 13: 1–5. The relation of Christians to civil government involves questions of the highest importance. **For the Lord's sake**—the best of motives. 'Lord,' 'Christ'; for both by Peter and Paul the word is almost always used in reference to Christ. **Whether,** etc. The king in this case is the Roman emperor. **As supreme**—as one *who is* supreme. His superiority in rank, etc., is a motive (*as*) why you should submit. It implies sovereignty over all other rulers of the Roman empire, as well as over the people. Whether the government is a monarchy or a republic is not the question. "The powers that be are ordained of God." (Rom. 13: 1.) Government, not necessarily the form of it, is a divine ordinance. **Governors**—rulers who presided over Roman provinces. Representatives of the king, they, too, should be obeyed. They are sent to maintain the government, and that can be done only by punishing (*vengeance*) those who refuse allegiance, and by commending (*praise*) those who are loyal. While the method of dealing with criminals should not be unnecessarily harsh, it ought not to be so mild as to lose the character of punishment. The fiendishness of secret attempts to take the life of rulers, and to demolish public buildings, deserves something much severer than is meted out to common criminals.

15. For introduces a reason why they should submit (ver. 13) to the ordinances of men—namely, that the slanderers, even if not led to glorify God, may at least be made to stop their slandering. **For so is**—for the will of God *is such*. *What* is the will of God? Neither *the well-doing, nor the putting to silence the ignorance of foolish men*, but both combined into one—*i. e., putting to silence by well-doing*. God's will should be sufficient to determine their course. No false views of freedom must be permitted to make them disloyal. Modern communism was not spawned from such words as these. **Well-doing**—in their general mode of life, but especially by obedience to rulers. **Put to silence**—primary meaning, "to muzzle, as oxen treading out grain." (1 Tim. 5: 18.) "But when the Pharisees had heard that he had put the Sadducees to silence"; *muzzled* them. (Matt. 22: 34.) The plain meaning is, *stop the mouth*, so that the objector finds himself unable to reply. **The ignorance**—ignorance begotten of culpable prejudice against the truth, as illustrated in the life of the Christians. **Of foolish men**—of *the* foolish men. The article points out the slandering Gentiles of ver. 12. Fools of this sort have not all died off.

16. Still anxious to keep them loyal to rulers, that the religion which they profess may not be dishonored. Whether the connection is with ver. 13, or with ver. 14, or with ver. 17, is not easily decided; with the first is most probable. Submit (ver. 13) **as free.** Free, though required to submit. Freedom and loyalty to rulers may co-exist. Only when, in its submission to rulers, the soul disobeys God, is it in bondage. And besides, in submitting to government they are free because they recognize government as appointed by God. **Your liberty**—the freedom implied in the word 'free.' Both the Common and the Revised Versions supply 'your' without necessity. *As free, and not using the freedom*—a needful caution. **For a cloak**—*as* a cloak, though some consider that *as* should be connected with *using*—as free, and not as using the freedom, etc. They must not use the freedom for a *covering* of *wickedness*. See Gal. 5: 13; 2 Pet. 2: 19. **As the servants of God**—as being, as knowing that you are God's servants. This is the positive, and of course the stronger, representation.

17 Honour all *men*. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king.
18 Servants, *be* subject to *your* masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward.

all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king.
18 [1]Servants, *be* in subjection to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also

1 Gr. *Household servants.*

They must not only (negatively) not attempt to hide wickedness by boasting of their freedom (Huther), but they must be as God's *servants*. No word in the Greek tongue (δοῦλοι, *slaves*) could have more strongly expressed the duty of being entirely subject to God. If the application of the term to Christians is not pleasant, it is because the word, as applied to those held in bondage to men, so often suggests degradation and injustice. Used in reference to Christians, it implies neither, but expresses only, or chiefly, *the rendering of absolute, unconditional service*. The Revised Version uses the strong word *bond-servants*. Elsewhere we learn that the service as required is just, and as rendered, is cordial; but these are not expressed by the word itself.

17. Closing the section which began at ver. 11. It is a fine specimen of rapid, condensed thinking. It is like a quick, powerful closing of orchestral music. The apostle ascends from men in general to men of spiritual relationship; from these he ascends to God himself, and ends by dropping to the key-note: 'Honor the king.' **Honour all men**—not humanity, but *men*, and men without exception are to be honored. Wealth, office, and learning may deserve respect, especially the last; but Peter has no thought of them here. Men are the work of God—that is the chief reason why they are to be honored. Honor the lowest of them, which can be done by helping them up. **Love the brotherhood**—the entire Christian body—that is, all Christians. These are supposed to be members of Christian churches; yet, as this is not universally the case, the love must not be restricted to such; and therefore it need not, it must not, be restricted to denominational lines. True Christian love for the universal brotherhood of Christians should be conscientiously cultivated, which is possible in connection with inflexible adherence to the truths and ordinances of Christianity. Christian love is not inconsistent with vigorous defense of truth, nor even with sharp invective against bold and persistent teachers of fatal error. See Matt. 23; 2 Pet. 2: 1–3, 17, 18; Jude 4, 8, 11–13. Compare Rom. 10: 1 with Rom. 16: 17, 18. But controversy among those who were alike begotten to the living hope should be conducted with delicate respect for one another's conscientious, though perhaps unfounded, convictions. Christ says, "Love your enemies" (Matt. 5: 44); Peter says nothing to the contrary. **Fear God**—reverence him. It includes love; but in contrast with honoring men and the king, the apostle enjoins awe in view of God's superiority over all. It implies humility. **Honour the king.** See on ver. 13.

18. SECOND EXHORTATION (*particular*). This is included under the general exhortation of ver. 13. In that all are exhorted to submit to every human institution; here is enjoined upon servants submission to their masters. **Servants**—*house-servants* (οἰκέται, pertaining to the house; not the stronger term δοῦλοι, *bond-servants*, *slaves*, used in ver. 16). Both words, however, were applied to persons held in involuntary servitude. Yet some house-servants may have been freemen. Slavery existed in the times of the apostles, and had long existed. It was allowed by the Roman government; and whatever may have been the conviction of individuals relative to its wrongfulness, no general and active combination against it had arisen. It was prevailing in the region to which this Epistle was sent. Yet *slave* is used but once in the Common Version (New Testament), and but once in the Common Version (Old Testament); *servant*, as in the passage before us, being preferred. The Revised Version uses for the same Greek word (δοῦλος) *servant* in Matt. 8: 9, but *bond servant* in 2: 16, of our Epistle. That all these servants were slaves cannot be proved; that none of them were slaves is entirely improbable; that a large majority of them were slaves is almost certain. See the context, and Eph. 6: 5-9; Col. 3: 22; 4: 1; 1 Tim. 6: 1, 2; Tit. 2: 9, 10; and the Epistle to Philemon. That Onesimus had been a slave would be conceded by all interpreters. See Hackett on the Epistle. **With all fear**—in fear of offending their masters, yet not with slavish fear,

19 For this *is* thankworthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully.
20 For what glory *is it*, if, when ye be buffeted for

19 to the froward. For this is [1] acceptable, if for conscience [2] toward God a man endureth griefs, suffer-
20 ing wrongfully. For what glory is it, if, when ye sin, and are buffeted *for it*, ye shall take it patiently?

1 Gr. *grace*.....2 Gr. *of*.

slaves though they were—for they are Christians; but with fear pervaded by fear of God. (1: 17.) 'All fear'; fear at every point where it would be necessary, in order to secure what the apostle here requires them to do. **The good**—*the kind*. **The froward**—*the crooked*, that is, the perverse, fretful, easily angered. "Untoward" is the translation in Acts 2: 40, and "crooked" in Phil. 2: 15 (Common Version); more consistently in the Revised Version, *crooked* in both places, but inconsistently with the rendering here. The character of the master, whether marked by kindness, or by severity, is not to be the standard by which the conduct of the servants is to be governed. They are to submit to their masters for the sake of One who is far above their masters, yet took upon him the form of a *bond-servant*. (δοῦλος. Phil. 2: 7.) They are to regard themselves as submitting to God rather than to men. We shall fail to appreciate the spirit of this inspired direction unless this is borne in mind. See Eph. 6: 5-7; Col. 3: 22-24; Tit. 2: 10.

This exhortation to servants no more implies approval of slavery than the command to submit to the king implies approval of monarchy in distinction from republicanism. The direction to submit was eminently wise, as the state of society was at that time. But while such were the directions for the time being, Christianity contemplated, by the equality in Christ which it taught (1 Cor. 12: 13; Gal. 3: 28; Philemon 16; Col. 4: 1), the final removal of slavery from the world. To Christianity is due the removal thus far. In his translation of Paul's Epistle to Philemon, Dr. Hackett uses *servant* instead of *slave;* yet he has no doubt that Onesimus was a fugitive from slavery.[1]

19, 20. From ver. 19 to the close of the chapter, the apostle enforces the duty expressed in ver. 18, chiefly by the duty of submission to masters whose treatment of them is severe. It is enforced by two considerations: 1. God's approval; 2. Christ's example. The former is taught in the verses before us. **For this is thankworthy**—what follows in the same verse. The original of 'thankworthy' is a noun, and is often rendered *grace*, as in the margin of the Revised Version. But some insist that it here means *praise*. For this is praise—that is, an object of praise. The meaning may be as follows: *For if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully—this is grace*—that is, it shows God's grace toward him; or, it conciliates the favor of God toward him. **If a man**—*if any one*. **For conscience toward God.** Some say: "The knowledge of God concerning us," because God knows your sufferings; but the better view is that which makes it refer to one's knowledge of God. The sense, then, is this: If through one's knowledge of God, as the Being who takes cognizance of all one's sufferings, one **endures,** *bears up under*, instead of sinking. **Grief**—*grievances*. **Suffering wrongfully;** allusion to such masters as might indulge in severity. It was the possible severity which would lead to the grievances.

Heaven me such uses send,
Not to pick bad from bad; but, by bad mend.

20. For what glory—a strong denial that there is any glory at all in so doing. **Buffeted.** The related noun means *a box on the*

1 "Slave," he says in a note, "(softened from sklave, and originally a national appellation, sklavonic, or sclavonic), is comparatively a modern word in our language, and altogether too restricted to represent the Greek δοῦλος." Dr. T. J. Conant says on Matt. 8: 9: "The word *servant* has, in English, the same extent of application as the Greek word δοῦλος. The latter (properly a bondman, a slave, from δέω, to bind), is often employed where the English word *bondman* or *slave* would be inappropriate. It is used, for example, as an expression of unlimited devotion to another's will; and this of his own free choice, and in the most honorable relations. . . . It is necessary in translating to employ a term that has the same comprehension as the Greek term. Compare, *e. g.*," [Luke] "17: 7-10. . . . ver. 10: *Say we are unprofitable servants;* unprofitable *bondmen* or *slaves* would not express the meaning." In his "Authorized Version," Trench has a paragraph upon the meaning of δοῦλοι (servants), from which it is clear that his view is substantially the same as that of Hackett and Conant.

your faults, ye shall take it patiently? but if, when ye
do well, and suffer *for it*, ye take it patiently, this *is*
acceptable with God.
21 For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ
also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye
should follow his steps:
22 Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his
mouth:

but if when ye do well and suffer *for it*, ye shall
21 take it patiently, this is [1] acceptable with God. For
hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suf-
fered for you, leaving you an example, that ye
22 should follow his steps: who did no sin, neither

1 Gr. *grace*.

ear, and so the verb means *to give a box on the ear*. Sometimes the smiting was done with the fist. Many of these Christian servants were doubtless made to feel, practically, the etymological meaning of the word; but the term was sometimes used to express a wider range of abuse. **For your faults**—the entire clause, more exactly, *if doing wrong and being buffeted;* yet the abusive treatment is supposed to be caused by the wrong doing. 'Doing wrong' is here, literally, *missing the mark*—a significant way of expressing the act of committing sin. **Take patiently**—*bear up under*. It has essentially the same meaning as *endure*, in ver. 19. **Acceptable with God.** In the Greek it is the word for grace, as ver. 19 ("*thankworthy*"); this is *grace*, and the word must have the same meaning as there. Notice the addition, 'with God.' Bearing up under abuse may be the result of natural heroism, or of philosophic pride. As enjoined by Peter, it is a virtue of heavenly birth.

21. This enforces the duty (ver. 18) by the example of Christ. They should bear up under the sufferings inflicted by masters, inasmuch as Christ suffered for them; and he suffered for them *without sin*, *patiently*, and *as their substitute*. See Crit. Notes. **Even**—unnecessarily inserted. **Hereunto**—not unto slavery; not, exclusively, unto suffering, but *unto patience under suffering*. **Called.** See Acts 14: 22; Rom. 8: 28–30; 1 Thess. 3: 3. It is only servants to whom he refers, yet the spirit of the words is applicable to all to whom the Epistle was sent. (3: 8, 9.) The calling implies divine purpose, but divine purpose relative to the patience enjoined, and not also relative to the sufferings inflicted, would have been poor comfort. The Christian who believes suffering to be only the result of natural law, or man's wickedness, or the devil's malignity, surrenders himself so far, however ignorantly, to one of the most pestiferous principles of Paganism. "God has nothing to do with it"—a very common saying—is not the teaching of Christianity. See what this same apostle taught on the Day of Pentecost concerning God's purpose relative to Christ's crucifixion. (Acts 2: 23.) Man's wickedness, always committed freely, is part of the good man's schooling. The point of harmony between man's freedom in wrong doing and God's purpose eludes us. Here every man is an agnostic. Denying the existence of such a point is easy, but the difficulty is not thereby removed. To the sharper sight of the next life that may be one of the things brought within its angle; it may not be. It may not be visible in the brightest light of eternity. **Because.** This assigns the reason why these Christian servants are called to suffer—namely, **Christ also suffered.** It is conceivable that Christ might have passed through the world without suffering, but he *suffered*. Peter sends the argument home by adding, *for you*—**for us,** in Common Version, but in Revised Version after the more approved Greek—for your good, or in your stead. Concerning the meaning of the preposition—that is, whether it implies substitution—see Crit. Note. **Leaving us.** Here, also, a better reading requires *you;* leaving *behind*, a clear allusion to the Lord's ascension. **An example.** The word means literally a copy to be followed in writing. As a child learns to write by imitating the copy at the head of the page, so we must imitate the suffering Christ by suffering ourselves, not complaining because we are not allowed to choose the kind, but accepting the kind which God gives. **Follow his steps**—a change of figure which rhetorical precision would condemn. They are to imitate the copy that they may follow *upon* his footsteps. See the same figure in Rom. 4: 12. Both figures being dropped, the simple form is, leaving an example for you to follow.

22. Who did no sin—the first fact in the suffering Redeemer's case. Jesus suffered, not as a wrong doer, but as a sinless one, which makes appeal to servants yet stronger. Though

23 Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed *himself* to him that judgeth righteously:

23 was guile found in his mouth: who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, threatened not; but committed [1]*himself* to him who judg-

1 Or, *his cause.*

Peter supposed them to be innocent under suffering, yet in this representation of Christ's sinlessness, there is an indirect allusion to their own want of sinlessness. The words are still another evidence that Peter had made the Old Testament a study. They are quoted, as also the remaining words of the verse, from Isa. 53: 9, not according to the Hebrew, but according to the Septuagint, which is believed to have been much used by the Jews in our Lord's time.

No sin—though born of a daughter of Eve, Jesus had no taint of the depravity of Eve. He lived among great sinners, yet took no harm from their character. He had human appetites, but not one of them became his master. He was capable of ambition, but no such vice found place in his heart. No man ever had greater reasons, greater opportunities, and greater power to indulge in revenge; yet he forgave the greatest personal insults, and loved the wrong doer even unto death. Wise above all the men of his time, he neither treasured up wisdom in self-gratification, nor, when disclosing it, disclosed it in vanity. With capacity for a life of study and meditation superior to that of any of his contemporaries, he gave himself to active toil for the good of others, seeking solitude only that by renewing his exhausted strength, and obtaining fresh supplies of spiritual power, he might continue his labors for the selfish and rebellious. He sought honor neither from the bad nor from the good; and, with bold consistency, cried in the ears of men, "How can ye believe which (*who*) receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour which cometh from God only?" In suffering, not less than in doing; in death, not less than in life, he was distinctly conscious of the spirit of obedience to the will of God, instead of being blindly impelled by the divinity within him. His virtues were not those of an angel or of God, but of man. They were thoroughly human; yet they were so united with the divine that the divine and the human were scarcely distinguishable. So in this God-man dwelt infinite excellence. (Heb. 7: 26; 2 Cor. 5: 21.) **Neither was guile found.** Though freedom from guile (*deceit*) is included in freedom from sin, yet Christ's freedom from that particular form of evil, so characteristic of fallen man, seemed to Peter to require, for the sake of servants, special mention. Nathanael was not sinless, but he had no guile, even according to Christ himself. (John 1: 47.) Such Nathanaels are rare. 'Was found'—more expressive than *was*. No guile *could be detected* in his words. (Rev. 14: 5.) See Winer. Neither his enemies, nor his friends, with the latter of whom he held the most intimate relations, could ever see in him the least deceit, though the former called him while his body lay in Joseph's tomb (Matt. 27: 63), "that deceiver." See more on 1: 7 concerning 'might be found.' Deceit in the mouth has bad parentage—deceit in the heart. (Mark 7: 22.) "Naught, naught, saith the buyer; but when he is gone his way then he boasteth" (Prov. 20: 14); the full-blown deception of not a few buyers in the present time. Elymas, the sorcerer (Acts 13: 8-10), "full of all subtilty"—the deceit of opposers of the gospel. Expose one such deceiver, and another springs up. Simon Magus (Acts 8: 23, 24), the deceit of a hypocrite, the worst kind. Nothing did the guileless Saviour so severely denounce as the last. Deceit in conducting religious affairs is sure to rebound upon those who practice it.

23. The second fact: *He suffered patiently*. The chain of argument enforcing the duty of servants to bear up under their sufferings, must not be defective; this link is therefore added. **Reviled.** Christ was the object of criticism during his entire public life, and this at times broke forth into such malignant accusations as that of being in league with Satan; being a glutton and a wine-bibber; a companion of persons loose in character; a boaster (Matt. 26: 61); a pretender (claiming to be the Messiah and King of Israel), and a blasphemer. But under no form of reviling did Christ revile in return. **He threatened not.** He denounced hypocrites with severity never equaled, but he never threatened in revenge for what he suffered. **But committed.** In the original the verb has no object. We may supply *himself*, or *his affairs*, or *it* (the reviling and suffering). Perhaps *his judg-*

24 Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed.

24 eth righteously: who his own self [1]bare our sins in his body upon the tree, that we, having died unto

1 Or, *carried up . . . to the tree.*

ment—that is, judgment of himself, may express the thought which lay in the mind of the writer. The Revised Version supplies *himself*, and puts *his cause* in the margin. **Judgeth righteously.** What confidence that he should be vindicated! Compare Job 19: 25–27. Nineteen centuries have passed, and evidence of his blamelessness, not stronger indeed than at first, is still spreading, and is destined to spread till "he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power." (1 Cor. 15: 24.) In the patience of Christ under suffering, his followers have a lesson of infinite persuasiveness.

24. The third fact: *He bare our sins.* This point applies to others than servants. Yet he returns to those who were suffering in servitude. The verse is one of inexpressible importance and preciousness. It answers the question: How *are we saved?* The meaning of a preposition (*for*, ver. 21) is not here the point. **Who his own self**—*who himself.* Whatever is here affirmed as having been done was done by Christ himself. Not an angel aided him in bearing man's sin. The strength ministered by an angel in Gethsemane (Luke 22: 43) was ministered that he might be able to bear it alone. **Bare our sins**—evidently suggested by Isa. 53, especially ver. 11, 12. In what sense did Christ bear our sins? By *taking them* away through the influence of his love in suffering? Then his sufferings were not a substitute for those which we deserve; he did not suffer *in our place.* Three ways of getting an answer are open to us: 1. We may show what Isaiah meant, assuming that Peter's meaning must be the same. 2. Without seeking Isaiah's meaning, we may inquire for Peter's meaning in the light of the New Testament. 3. We may combine both methods. The twofold method will bring us to the conclusion that Christ bore our sins upon the cross in the sense of suffering what God accepted in place of the penalty deserved by ourselves. This is the very least that can be said. Some think that he bore our sins in the sense of suffering the penalty itself—the penalty due to all the sins of all human beings. As the sufferer was God-man; as his sufferings were intense beyond all human conception; as they were chiefly the sufferings of the soul; and as there was an unfathomable depth of mystery in them, we cannot limit them by any known standard; and yet, strictly speaking, penalty (punishment) implies guilt. But that guilt cannot be ascribed to Christ is clear from ver. 22. If it be said that guilt may be ascribed to him figuratively, that is conceding that guilt cannot be ascribed to him in the sense in which it is ascribed to an actual sinner. For the sake of precision of language, therefore, it seems better to restrict the term *penalty* to punishment inflicted for one's own sin. In John 1: 29, a different Greek word is used for *taketh away;* but as Meyer and others say, that word may mean either *take away*, or *take upon himself* in order to bear. Substitution is the meaning expressed there, as well as in the passage before us. See Crit. Notes.

> Alas! alas!
> Why all the souls that were, were forfeit once;
> And he that might the vantage best have took
> Found out the remedy: How would you be,
> If he, which is the top of judgment, should
> But judge as you are? Oh, think on that;
> And mercy then will breathe within your lips,
> Like man new made.

In his own body—*in his body.* Compare "present *your bodies* a living sacrifice." (Rom. 12: 1.) No contrast between the body and the soul is intended. Christ bore our sins in his soul as truly as in his body. Compare Matt. 26: 38. But as it was the body which was nailed to the cross, it was natural to make it prominent in the tragic representation. Yet 'body' may be used here, as in Romans, for the entire person. **On the tree.** Primary meaning, *on the wood*, or *on a beam of wood.* The use of the original word for *cross* was borrowed from the Hebrew language, and is therefore called a Hebraism. The chief baker was to be hanged on a *tree.* (Gen. 40: 19.) A body was not to remain all night on a *tree.* (Deut. 21: 23.) Joshua hanged five kings on five *trees.* (Josh. 10: 26.) "Tree, like *treow* in Anglo Saxon, was often used in early English in the sense of 'wood' in general, as 'vessells of tre'

25 For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.

sins, might live unto righteousness; by whose 25 [1]stripes ye were healed. For ye were going astray like sheep; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and [2]Bishop of your souls.

1 Gr. *bruise*.....2 Or, *Overseer*.

(Chaucer), 'cuppe of tre'; and also specifically to denote something made of wood, particularly a bar or beam; a meaning still preserved in the compounds *axle-tree, cross-tree, whipple-tree.* . . . The cross in early English poetry is often called 'Christos tre' (Chaucer)."—Ezra Abbott in "Smith's Bib. Dict.," p. 3321. There were modes of putting criminals to death in our Lord's day to which such deep disgrace would not have been affixed. The final object of Christ's death, in the case of men themselves, was to make them "dead to sins and alive unto righteousness." See Rom. 6: 11, and consider the relation of this great inward change, wrought by the Saviour's substituted sufferings, to baptism. (Rom. 6: 3-6.) Dead *to* sins, not dead in sins. (Eph. 2: 1.) In the latter case sins are viewed as the "efficient cause" of the state of death. **By whose stripes**—not scourging, but the effect of it. The Greek word is in the singular number, and may refer, therefore, not merely to scourging, but to his entire course of suffering —death as the culmination of all. **Were healed.** Sin is a fearful disease; regeneration is restoration to health. Sinlessness, to which the regenerate are to attain, is life in the form of perfect health; and this life is attributed to the death inflicted upon Christ. Self-healing is impossible, for the tendency of man is ever toward a worse state; and great care should be taken by those who use means to heal others, that the means be not such as to heal slightly. (Jer. 6: 14.) Bodily disease may need change of treatment; for diseases of the soul the apostolic method is still good, and in revivals of religion departure from that method shows how little reliance is placed upon God to do the needed work. Giving the wrong medicine shows ignorance of the disease. On the "Satisfaction of Christ," as treated by Grotius against Socinius, see in "Bib. Sac.," 1879, a translation of the Latin treatise by Rev. F. H. Foster. Grotius' view, that the sufferings of Christ were a penalty or punishment inflicted upon Christ himself—that is, the penalty which is deserved by us, would now find few advocates; but the treatise as a whole, it is quite superfluous to say, is one of great power against those errors of Socinians which are more or less distinctly reproduced in Unitarianism.

25. The writer has said that we should live unto righteousness, and that they have been healed. This easily suggests their former state, and all the more easily the figure by which it is represented, because in the very chapter (Isa. 53) which has supplied him with the main thought, men are represented as going astray like sheep. (Ver. 6.) **As sheep going astray**—by the more approved Greek, *Ye were straying as sheep.* In most affecting terms it expresses the fact of their former separation from God. Plato represents men as God's sheep, but not for the purpose of showing that they have strayed. The remarkable thirty-fourth chapter of Ezekiel, in which the metaphor, greatly expanded, is applied to Israel, should be read in connection with the description by Peter. See also John 10 and Ps. 23. Not as slaves, but as sinners, they were once straying, yet their state of servitude before conversion adds to the effect of the description. Straying sheep encounter want and wolves, and straying men are fearfully exposed to teachers of error (*thieves, robbers, hirelings, wolves*, John 10: 8, 12). False teachers are both straying sheep and prowlers. **Are now returned**—*have now turned*, but this is not an implication that divinely ministered strength to turn was not needed and given. **Bishop**—*overseer.* The Common Version and the Revised Version are alike unfortunate; for *bishop* does not necessarily imply oversight, which is precisely what is implied in the Greek. A bishop, in the sense used not long after the apostles died, was unknown. **The Shepherd and Bishop** (*overseer*)—Christ, not God, though in 5: 2 Peter calls the elect the flock of God. That Christ is meant is clear from Ezek. 34: 23, 24. He is *the chief Shepherd.* (5: 4.) **Your souls**—connected with 'Shepherd' as well as with 'Bishop.'

Thus is the duty of bearing up under their sufferings enjoined upon the servants by the

example of Christ as a sufferer; more particularly by the three facts that his sufferings were borne without sin, with patience, and as a substitute. The appeal is adapted to all Christian sufferers of all times. This chapter is even richer than the first. Like that, it is chiefly hortatory, but here also the practical is not without strong support in doctrine. While the exhortations of the first are radiant with electing love, shining indeed, also, with that glory of Christ which was to come after his sufferings, the exhortations of this chapter glow with ineffable brightness; for Christ's death appears in its mightiest efficacy. Verses 24, 25 give additional evidence (compare 1: 18, 19) of Peter's attainment of correct views concerning the necessity and object of Christ's death.

CRITICAL NOTES.—CHAPTER II.

3. εἰς σωτηρίαν (*unto salvation*) is found after αὐξηθῆτε (*may grow*) in so many valuable manuscripts, that it is judged to have been originally a part of the Epistle. It is accepted as genuine by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers. "It indicates," says Huther, "the aim of all Christian growth."

The Greek word for honour (τιμη) occurs in Peter, in not one case with the meaning *preciousness*, unless it has it here. It occurs in 1: 7; 3: 7; 2 Peter 1: 17, and in the Common Version is translated *honor*. The Revised Testament of the Bible Union translates *honor* in the case before us. The English and American Revision translates *preciousness*, but puts *honor* in the margin. It translates in all the other passages *honor*. Translating differently here is one of the few inconsistencies of the Revised Version. Not only the context, but the *usus loquendi* (customary way of speaking), shows that *honor* is the true meaning. The old interpreter Bengel, born in 1687, understood it as the Revisers of 1611 did, but in the American translation of his Notes he is corrected by the editor, who says that the rendering of the English is quite out of the question. In the German, Luther's translation, is the same as that of the Common English Version. On the other hand, the view which is here taken is that of Wiesinger, Gerhard, De Wette, Brückner, Weiss, Schott (all from Huther), of Huther himself, Frommüller, and Alford. Lillie seems to prefer *preciousness*, and applies it to the Saviour, but afterwards in a note admits that *honor* would be rather more agreeable to current Greek usage. *The* before *honor* points to ἔντιμον (*honored*, "precious") in ver. 6. The stone is *honored;* and he that believeth in him shall not be *dishonored*. You believe; therefore to you is not dishonor, but *the honor*. This view is held by Dr. Robinson also, who defines τιμὴ as a state of honor conferred in reward. The position of πιστεύουσιν (*who believe*) is worthy of notice: *Unto* (*for*) *you, therefore, is the honor, for you who believe*, so that even if τιμὴ should be translated *preciousness*, and should be applied to Christ, not that but πιστεύουσιν (*believe*) would be the emphatic word.

7. εἰς (*into*) stands before κεφαλὴν (*head*). If the genius of the English tongue permitted it to be translated, the entire clause would stand thus: This *has become for* the corner-stone. In the Greek, the preposition expresses *design* and *result*—that is, a *designed result*—a meaning which, according to Buttmann, εἰς sometimes has. That ἐγενήθη (*has become*), though a passive, may be rendered as above (with an intransitive sense), see Buttmann, pp. 51, 52; and that, though an aorist, it may express by the implication of the context, "the continuance of the action, and its working down to the present time," see Buttmann, pp. 197, 198.

10. They were οὐ λαός (*a not-people*); λαός (*people*), οὐ (*not*). The latter word standing before the former is an instance of what is called *negatived substantives*. The peculiarity is distinctly recognized by Winer: "οὐ combined with nouns into one idea, obliterates their meaning altogether (Rom. 10: 19; 1 Pet. 2: 10), all quotations from the Old Testament." It is more neatly expressed by Buttmann: "Examples of negatived *substantives—i. e.*, of substantives transformed by the negative into their opposites, and blending with it, as it were, into a single word, occur only in Old Testament quotations. The negative then is always οὐ, because compounds of the sort are formed in Hebrew with לֹא. Rom. 9: 25; 1 Pet. 2: 10; . . . Rom. 10: 19."

13, 18. ὑποτάγητε — *submit yourselves* (ver. 18) is the aorist passive, with the sense of the middle voice; "a pure reflexive," as Buttmann says of the same word in James 4: 7. *Humble*

yourselves (1 Pet. 5: 6; James 4: 10); *joined themselves* (Acts 5: 3); but here the manuscripts differ. On the general subject (the use in the New Testament of the aorist passive in a reflexive sense), see Winer, § 39, p. 261, Huther on this (ver. 13), and Buttmann, pp. 51, 52. Anticipating in part the consideration of ver. 18 and 3: 1, it may be added that the participle ὑποτασσόμενοι—*be subject* (ver. 18), *be in subjection* (3: 1) stands in both cases in connection with ὑποτάγητε—*submit yourselves* (ver. 13), thus: *Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man . . . servants being subject to masters, . . . wives being subject to their husbands.* Though participles, they are not improperly translated into English as if they were verbs.

21. Christ suffered *for* you. Did Christ suffer for men in the sense of suffering for their good? or did he suffer for them in the sense of suffering in their place—that is, was Christ the sinner's substitute? The difference is very great, and involves the entire question of the way of salvation. The Revisers of 1611 use the same *for* to translate two different Greek prepositions, ἀντι and ὑπερ. But there are passages in which the former means, *in place of* (Luke 11: 11; 1 Cor. 11: 15; Matt. 20: 28); are there any in which the latter has the same meaning? That it is generally used in the sense of *for*, *for the good of*, is evident; but that it is never used in the sense of *instead*, *in place of*—that is, that it never conveys the idea of substitution, is more, probably, than ought to be affirmed. See Philemon, ver. 13: "Whom I would have retained with me, that *in thy stead* (ὑπὲρσοῦ) he might have ministered unto me"; "as his representative—substitute" (Hackett), and the same interpreter cites 2 Cor. 5: 21: "For he made him to be sin *for us*" (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν). Winer, after giving to ὑπὲρ in several passages the meaning *for*, *for the benefit of*, adds: "In most cases, one who acts in behalf of another takes his place (1 Tim. 2: 6; 2 Cor. 5: 15); hence, ὑπὲρ is sometimes nearly equivalent to ἀντί, instead, *loco*" (*in place of*). He refers to the very decisive Philemon 13. One is surprised to hear Winer say after this, in a note, "Still, in doctrinal passages relating to Christ's death (Gal. 3: 13; Rom. 5: 6, 8; 14: 15; 1 Pet. 3: 18, etc.), it is not justifiable to render ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν and the like rigorously by *instead of*. Ἀντὶ is the more definite of the two prepositions. Ὑπὲρ signifies merely *for* men, for their deliverance; and leaves undetermined the precise sense in which Christ died for them." Robinson admits the sense *instead of* in Philemon, and thinks it may be the meaning in 2 Cor. 5: 20; Eph. 6: 20. Compare 1 Pet. 3: 18. The question, however, in what sense Christ died for sinners does not turn wholly upon the meaning of a preposition. See upon ver. 24.

24. The Greek for *bare* is ἀνήνεγκεν, from ἀναφέρω—ἀνα (*up*) and φέρω (bear); to bear up from a lower to a higher place. Where the Common Version says *on*, the Greek uses ἐπὶ (*upon*). The verb and the preposition taken together mean *bore up upon*, and as sacrifices were carried up to the altar and offered (compare James 2: 21), it has been insisted that Peter here views the cross as an altar, and represents Christ as bearing our sins up to the cross to sacrifice them there. See Col. 2: 14. But the cross of Christ is never represented in the New Testament as an altar; and neither in the Old Testament, nor in the New, are our sins viewed as the sacrifice which is brought to the altar. (Huther.) *Bearing our sins he ascended the cross* is another way of expressing the meaning. ἀναφέρω does not always mean to bear *up*, in the sense of taking the object to a higher place. See Heb. 9: 28; Isa. 53: 12; in the latter of which verses the word is used in the Septuagint for נָשָׂא and סָבַל. "But there is no necessity for regarding the case as anything more than the very common one of ἐπὶ, with an accusative; when the verb of motion, appropriate to such a construction is suppressed, and it is to be only mentally supplied: *bare our sins in his body* [when lifted up] upon the tree." (Lillie.) The Revised Version has in the margin, "Or, *carried up . . . to the tree*," a suggestion made by the American Committee. Farrar ("Early Days of Christianity") makes substantially the same, but less elegant, rendering: "Carried up our sins in his own body on to the tree." The marginal reading of the Revised Version may be accepted, without attributing the idea of altar and sacrifice to the verb.

CHAPTER III.

LIKEWISE, ye wives, *be* in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also

1 In like manner, ye wives, *be* in subjection to your

Ch. 3: SECOND SERIES OF EXHORTATIONS (continued).

1. THIRD EXHORTATION (*particular*), addressed to wives whose husbands are unbelievers. **Likewise.** Beginning a new exhortation, it directs to the preceding one (2:18), but it must not be understood as hinting that the "subjection" of wives to their husbands is of the same nature as that of servants to their masters. **Be in subjection.** As in 2:18, the exact translation is, *being subject*, and, like the participle in that place, must be connected with the verb in 2:13. **Your own.** No such contrast between their own husbands and other men is intended as to imply warning against being led into illicit connections, though some strongly insist that there is. On the other hand, the original word, which is not a mere possessive pronoun, seems intended to express something more than the mere fact that they *are* their husbands. See Critical Notes.

The duty enjoined can neither be reasoned away nor ridiculed away. The same requirement is made by the Holy Spirit through Paul. (Eph. 5:22-24; Col. 3:18; 1 Tim. 2:11, 12; Titus 2:5.) That Paul was never married is nothing to the purpose; it is certain that the Spirit of God could give a just command to wives through an unmarried apostle; but as if to rebuke mockers of Paul, a married apostle is authorized to say the same thing. "It is certainly a noticeable coincidence that these exhortations should be found exclusively in the Epistles addressed to Asiatics, nor is it improbable that they were more particularly needed for them than for Europeans." But in Rome, Athens, and Corinth, the relation of husband and wife had long been so very unlike what it ought to have been, that to us there seems to have been no less necessity for exhorting Christian wives there to be in subjection to their husbands, than Christian wives in Asia Minor; and no less necessity for exhorting husbands to love their wives. The silence referred to by the writer above cited is of little consequence; it was not to be expected that such a singling out of classes would be made in every epistle. The prominence recently given to the subject of man's relation to woman should make us more desirous to ascertain, fearlessly, the teachings of the Bible. These can be indicated only in the briefest manner.

BEFORE THE FALL.

1. The subordination of the woman to the man was ordained by the Creator. The man was created first; the woman next. The man was created from the earth; the woman "from the body of man. By this the priority and superiority of the man, and the dependence of the woman upon the man, are clearly established as an ordinance of divine creation." (Keil.) See Gen. 2:7, 21, 22. "To create another human being wholly distinct in substance from himself, would introduce into the world a being independent of himself, antagonistic to him, and having no hold on his sympathy as part of himself." (Dr. T. J. Conant.) 2. This original authority of the husband and subordination of the wife, so far at least as it is based upon the ground that the man was created first, is recognized by Paul. (1 Tim. 2:13.) 3. Nature teaches that unless the marriage tie may be dissolved upon every difference of opinion which may arise between the husband and the wife, some means must be used for adjusting the difference. One way of effecting this would be *force*—the method most prevalent among those not enlightened by Christianity. The weaker—be it the man or the woman—would be under the necessity of yielding. But the use of force is forbidden by nature. Another way remains—*i. e.*, subordination either of the man to the woman, or of the woman to the man. Had the woman been created first, and had the man been formed out of one of the woman's ribs, it is clear that the woman should have been regarded as having the authority, and then the man would have been under obligation to receive the woman's decision in case of difference of opinion. 4. That this subordination of the woman to the man, even while both were without moral fault, was to be maintained in love by the woman, and that the superiority of the man was to be maintained

in tenderness, and not in lordly superciliousness, is clear from two facts: *a.* That the woman was made from the man. *b.* That she was to be a helpmeet for him—"a helper suited to him" (Conant); "'a help of his like' (Keil)—'that is, a helping being, in which, as soon as he sees it, he may recognize himself.'" (Delitzsch.) In her subordination Eve was not restive, and in his superiority Adam was not exacting.

After the Fall.

1. The woman loses sight of the relation in which she stood to Adam, and, in independence of his authority, does what will issue in destroying the purer form of the love which had existed between them. She should have done nothing which would seem like aiming to be her husband's co-ordinate, much less what would seem like aiming *to get the upper hand of him.* "Adam might have done the same thing." Possibly, but it is the business of the interpreter to deal with the actual rather than with the possible. This disregard of her relation to Adam as her constituted superior, is not, indeed, the main thing in her sin, but it is that with which we are just now concerned. 2. "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." (Gen. 3: 16.) This foretells the subordination of the wife as it was to become in consequence of the fall. Subordination, in this new form, intensified by human passion on both sides, is here represented as a punishment of the woman for her sin. How fearfully has the prophecy been fulfilled! In Pagan and Mohammedan countries the wife has failed to recognize in any religiousness of spirit her subordination to the husband. The husband has equally failed to recognize the tender nature of the authority with which he was originally invested.

> I will be master of what is mine own;
> She is my goods, my chattels; she is my house,
> My household stuff, my field, my barn,
> My horse, my ox, my ass, my any thing;
> And here she stands, touch her whoever dare.

This is true, not only of the half-civilized and the savage, but also of Athenians and Romans. The wife has been rebellious, and no wonder; the husband has been a tyrant, and no wonder.

After the Coming of Christ.

1. Christianity aims to restore the husband and the wife to the right relation. It requires the husband to love his wife (Eph. 5: 25, 28; Col. 3: 19) as a companion, a helper, an adviser; and it aims to make the wife worthy of such love. It aims to bring to an end (1 Cor. 9: 5; Gal. 3: 26-28) that separation of interests which has so marked domestic life since the fall, and to make the interests of the husband and the wife as completely one[1] as that between Christ and the Church. "Not a rivalry with the functions of man, but an elevation of her own functions as high as his" (Gladstone), is the further aim of Christianity. But Christianity does not purpose to accomplish this by reversing the original relation. It therefore says most distinctly that the husband is the head of the wife (Eph. 5: 23), even as Christ is the Head of the Church, and enjoins upon the wife submission to the husband. Without making the wife the co-ordinate of the husband, it gives her substantial equality with him. When the husband recognizes all this as the aim of Christianity, and when the wife also recognizes it, happiness will mark the domestic state. "Authority, kindly exercised, and subordination, quietly acknowledged, promote the development of the affections, to which there is nothing more dangerous than rivalry." (Hugh Davey Evans, LL. D.)

2. In spite of the elevating influence of Christianity upon woman, views have been urged upon the public which, if generally adopted, would sling domestic life into chaos. The viler doctrines promulgated can never, perhaps, be generally received; but the tendency of some modern views is to turn married life back into that state of separate and rival interests which has been the curse of both the husband and the wife wherever revealed religion has been unknown or disregarded. Secretiveness, and even deception in either toward the other, may thus come to characterize the relation which, more than any other of an earthly kind, Christianity requires

[1] See the speech of Queen Katharine to the king, in Henry VIII., act 2 scene 4, in illustration of conscious loyalty to a husband.

may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives;
2 While they behold your chaste conversation *coupled* with fear.
3 Whose adorning, let it not be that outward *adorning* of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel;

own husbands; that, even if any obey not the word, they may without the word be gained by the [1] behaviour of their wives; 2 beholding your chaste [1] behaviour *coupled* with fear. 3 Whose *adorning* let it not be the outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing jewels of gold, or of putting on apparel;

1 Or, *manner of life.*

to be distinguished for openness and confidence. Peter's direction, then, viewed in the light shed upon it from other parts of the word of God, is at once most important and just. Reduced to the last point, there remains this: When, after mutual presentation of views upon a given course, agreement is impossible, the woman should yield to the opinion of her husband, those cases excepted in which she would sin by so doing; and in yielding, should feel herself not dishonored, but honored; because doing precisely that which Christianity requires. In yielding to her husband, she yields to him who is the wise Author of the relation. Submission to the final decision of the husband may be pointed and poisoned by the accusation that the decision is unjust; in which case, the very quintessence of obstinacy can be seen through the thin disguise of submission. It may be added that in much that has recently been said concerning woman's subordination to man, the entire tendency is to disregard the teachings of the Scriptures as of no account. But the Bible is as good authority upon this question as upon the duty of man to do all in his power to effect the intellectual and religious elevation of woman.

That if any. 'That' indicates the reason why they should submit. **Also** is misplaced; it should stand before *if*, and be changed into *even*, thus: *that even if any (some) obey not.* It may perhaps be inferred that the husbands of most of them were believers. But even if some obeyed not, it was possible that they might be won, etc. **Obey not.** It seems to imply positive rejection of the word. (2: 8 and compare 1: 22.) **Without the word.** Peter uses no article—'*Without word.*' He refers, not to the word as publicly preached, but probably to talking by the wives themselves; not that all speaking to their husbands is forbidden, but he suggests as the chief means of winning them their **conversation**—i. e., *walk, conduct*—

> The silence often of pure innocence
> Persuades, when speaking fails.

Sharp criticism of the husband on account of his defects, even if they are moral defects, and a habit of complaining at her lot, will not only not win him to the gospel—it will make his rejection of it the stiffer. Paul says: "Faith cometh by *hearing*, and hearing by *the word* of God"; and so if the husband shall be won by means of the holy walk of the wife, it will be none the less true that the word will lie at the basis of the other instrumentality.

2. While they behold. See on 2: 12. **Your chaste,** etc.—*your deportment chaste in fear*—'chaste' used in the general sense of *pure*, as in James 3: 17. **Fear**—awe either toward God or toward the husband; more probably the latter. As the husband is exhorted (ver. 7) to honor his wife, the fear is far from slavish. It is holy apprehension of doing anything which shall appear to conflict with the duty enjoined in ver. 1, and so creating an obstacle to his conversion.

3. In this and ver. 4, submission to their husbands is still enjoined, but this is done by exhorting them to the exercise of qualities which will certainly lead to it—meekness and quietness of spirit; and to these qualities they are exhorted negatively, in contrast with that vanity which would lead them to make the adornment of their persons, their *bodies* indeed, the chief object of concern. Literally, *whose adorning let it be, not the outward of plaiting the hair*, etc. In the Common Version 'adorning' is repeated, and is printed in italics. The repetition is necessary, in order to express what the Greek says without repetition, and that very necessity makes the italics needless: *Whose adorning let it be, not the outward adorning, . . . but let it be*, etc. **Plaiting**—*braiding*, not for convenience, which might be allowable, but for ornament. **Gold**—*golden ornaments, jewels of gold.* (Revised Version.) **Apparel**—*garments* (plural in the original), worn for show; no reference to convenience. 'Plaiting,' 'wearing,' 'putting on.' Notice the activity of women in this sort of self-adorning. Vanity makes

4 But *let it be* the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, *even the ornament* of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price.
5 For after this manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands:
6 Even as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord:

4 but *let it be* the hidden man of the heart, in the incorruptible *apparel* of a meek and quiet spirit
5 which is in the sight of God, of great price. For after this manner aforetime the holy women also, who hoped in God, adorned themselves, being in
6 subjection to their own husbands: as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose children ye now

1 Or, *husbands (as Sarah . . . ye are become), doing well, and not being afraid.*

nimble fingers. Notice also the very emphatic position of 'not'; yet the negative thought which it introduces is not the leading one; that is introduced by 'but.' (Ver. 4.) The meaning of this prohibition will escape us, unless we bear in mind the extravagant love of ornament which characterized the Oriental mind, and the great irreligiousness which led to it. The Egyptian monuments tell surprising tales of female vanity, and the inspired prophet speaks of "the bravery of their tinkling ornaments about their feet, and their cauls, and their round tires like the moon, the chains, and the bracelets, and the mufflers, the bonnets, and the ornaments of the legs, and the head bands, and the tablets, and the ear rings, the rings, and the nose jewels, the changeable suits of apparel, and the mantles, and the wimples, and the crisping pins, the glasses, and the fine linen, and the hoods, and the vails." (Isa. 3: 18-23.) It is what Calvin calls the *morbum vanitatis quo mulieres laborant* (in Huther), *the disease of vanity under which women labor*, that Peter blames. Woman's love of ornament is a root of all evil, not less than man's love of money. Women may sin by wearing too little clothing as well as by wearing too much ornament. As the remedy for love of money in man is holiness (1: 15, 16; 2: 9), so also is holiness the remedy for love of outward adornment in woman. Giving too little attention to the decoration of their bodies will not, probably, very soon become a besetting sin of women.

4. The apostle tells them what their adorning ought to be. **The hidden man of the heart.** This is the general form of expressing the contrast with outward adorning. The ornaments in which their irreligious neighbors delight appeal to the eye; this, the man of the heart, is 'hidden,' pertains to what is within. Compare Rom. 7: 22 (the inward man); Eph. 3: 16 (the inner man); 2 Cor. 4: 16 (the inward man). **In that which is not corruptible,** etc., may be rendered: *in the incorruptibleness of a meek and quiet spirit.* It is this of which the hidden man consists. Instead of fondness for outward ornament, they should adorn themselves with meekness (Matt. 5: 5) and quietness; and, unlike gold and superfluous apparel, such qualities are not corruptible—are imperishable. With such virtues they cannot fail to be submissive to their husbands. This spirit, whatever may be said of the world's judgment, is **in the sight of God of great price.** God is infinitely able to estimate the respective values. Man judges by a false standard. 'Great price,' *costly;* applied by Paul (1 Tim. 2: 9) to "array" (raiment), and by Mark (14: 3) to "spikenard." Compare ver. 3, 4, with 1 Tim. 2: 9, 10.

5. For strengthens the main exhortation (ver. 1) and the subordinate one of vs. 3, 4. **After this manner**—in the way just described. He draws an illustration from the times of the Old Testament. **Trusted in God**—*hoped.* The comma of the English (both the Common and the Revised Version) ought not to have been inserted between also' and 'who'; the connection is closer than the comma indicates. It was not **holy women** only who adorned themselves, but holy women 'who hoped in God.' According to the commonly received Greek, hoped *upon* God; but according to valuable manuscripts, hoped *in* God. They were adorned within. **Being in subjection.** See on the same in ver. 1. Submitting themselves to their own husbands was one of the manifestations of their meekness and quietness. **Their own.** See on the same in ver. 1, and in Critical Notes.

6. An eminent example is seen in Sarah, the wife of their distinguished progenitor. **Even**—a needless insertion. **Obeyed.** The original term is a mild one. *listened.* She *listened* to him, and it is implied that she listened to him in submissiveness of spirit. **Calling him lord** (Gen. 18: 12); doubtless the customary way of addressing him. Sarah was not faultless. In the affair of Hagar and Ishmael she showed more independence than was delicate, and more feeling than was necessary.

whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement.

7 Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with *them* according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the

are, if ye do well, and are not [1]put in fear by any terror.

7 Ye husbands, in like manner, dwell with *your wives* according to knowledge, giving honour [2]unto

1 Or, *afraid with*.....2 Gr. *unto the female vessel, as weaker.*

A meek and quiet spirit even then would have been more womanly, and better would it have been had she respectfully and gently declined to unite with her liege lord in one or two instances of deception. Yet she was usually so decorous and obedient that the apostle deemed her worthy of imitation by all pious women. "There be many women *now-a-days* that break away from their husbands." Compare 1 Sam. 25: 10. **Whose daughters.** The Greek means *children*, whether sons or daughters. Whose children **ye are** (*became* at the time of their conversion, but implying that they are so now), in the sense of spiritual descent. **As long as**—inserted by the Revisionists of 1611 to aid in bringing out what they supposed to be the meaning; but reference to time is erroneous. Nor ought *if* (Revised Version) to be supplied, as if they became Sarah's spiritual children on condition that they do good; nor *because*, as if they became children of Sarah because they do good. The meaning may be expressed thus: Whose children ye became, *as shown by your well-doing*—that is, in "their entire course of life, with especial reference to their marriage relations." (Huther.) **Are not afraid,** etc., is, literally, *fearing no frightening, no dread;* or, as some, not quite exactly, would say, *fearing no fear.* "Feared exceedingly" (Mark 4: 41), is, literally, *feared a great fear.* In 1 John 5: 16 is a similar peculiarity, "sin a sin"; in Col. 2: 19, "increaseth with the increase." It is an intense form of expression, and was not very seldom used in the Hebrew language before it came into use in the Greek. The peculiarity, though not quite so marked, is found here also. The apostle exhorts them not to fear that which, in itself, is adapted to make them fear; or, not to fear those who may attempt to make them fear. The men of the world, or, as the context requires, their ungodly husbands, may oppose; but they are not to fear. Some take from 'as' to 'ye are' as a parenthesis; thus: being in subjection to their own husbands (as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord, whose children ye are become), doing well, and not being afraid. This assumes that the participle for 'doing well' is to be connected with 'women' in ver. 5. If this is the right construction (which is by no means certain), it follows that after speaking of the 'holy women' of former times, the writer pauses a moment to illustrate by the case of Sarah as one of the class, and then, resuming, completes his description of the holy women, characterizing them as 'doing well,' etc. The Revised Version has this form in the margin as an alternative reading, and Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament has the same.

7. FOURTH EXHORTATION (*particular*); addressed to husbands. **Likewise**—directs to the exhortation given to wives at ver. 1, and hints that husbands are under obligations to their wives, as well as wives to their husbands. The form of the obligation is in part different. Husbands, neither here nor elsewhere, are required to be in subjection to their wives. The spirit of the obligation is the same—that is, the same in so far as both the husband and the wife are to be controlled by love. **Dwell with them**—refers to general daily intercourse. **According to knowledge.** In your marriage relations show intelligence and judgment. **Giving honour,** etc. In this part of the verse the meaning is not well given. Translate: *Dwelling according to knowledge with the female vessel as the weaker, rendering honor* [to them] *as also fellow heirs.* 'Vessel.' The husband is a vessel as well as the wife; but the wife is the weaker vessel. The word is applied to men (1 Thess. 4: 4); to human beings without distinction of sex. (Rom. 9: 21.) 'Weaker.' Not the man is a weak vessel, and the woman a weaker one. No such comparison is intended, and such a comparison would spoil the appeal; for it is just because the man is here assumed to be a strong vessel that he is exhorted to discharge his obligations to the woman. 'The weaker' cannot mean weaker in mind, for that women as a class would prove themselves, under equally favorable conditions, constitutionally inferior to men as a class, has not yet been shown to be even probable. Every cen-

weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered.
8 Finally, *be ye* all of one mind, having compassion

the woman, as unto the weaker vessel, as being also joint-heirs of the grace of life; to the end that your prayers be not hindered.
8 Finally, *be* ye all likeminded, [1] compassionate, lov-

1 Gr. *sympathetic.*

tury has been brilliant with women of mental capacity which quite overtopped that of a large majority of men. The wife is the weaker vessel because she has been made subordinate. In harmony with this subordination she is inferior to man in strength of body. "But Peter speaks of the woman as the weaker vessel without intending thereby disparagement or offence to the sex, or to any particularly strong-minded or strong-bodied member of it. It is no insult to the vine to say that it is weaker than the tree to which it clings; or to the rose to say that it is weaker than the bush which bears it." (Lillie.) **Giving honour unto the wife**—expresses the chief thought. The wife's submission, then, is not dishonorable. **And as being fellow heirs,** etc. Not fellow heirs with one another, but with their husbands. The wife is to receive the incorruptible possession (1: 4), as well as the husband, which is a good reason for rendering honor—*i. e.*, by esteeming her. See Rom. 8: 17; Eph. 3: 6; Heb. 11: 9. **Grace of life**—grace consisting of life. **Your prayers**—perhaps family prayers offered by the husband or by both. Of Philip Henry it is said that "he and his wife constantly prayed together morning and evening; and never, if they were together at home or abroad, was it intermitted." (Dr. Mombert in Fronmüller.) Inference: Their married life must have been harmonious. They must have constantly borne in mind the relation which each was required to maintain toward the other, without, however, being distinctly conscious of a purpose to do so. Private prayers may be included. **Hindered**—cut into, cut in pieces, from which came the meaning—*impede, hinder.* (Huther.) Some say, prevented from rising to the throne of God; but Peter is aiming to prevent their prayers from being omitted. What may cause them to be omitted? Not dwelling according to knowledge with the wife as the weaker vessel, and not honoring her as a fellow heir, etc. The disharmony which will result will cut prayer to pieces; the services will be wholly omitted. The same thing might happen if the wife should be unmindful of her own obligation; but Peter plies the wife with one kind of argument, and the husband with another kind.

8. Exhortations to distinct classes having been closed, the apostle concludes this second series with exhortations to all, growing out of their relations to persecutors. It is remarkable that in this section the most simple practical hints are found in juxtaposition with one of the most difficult passages in the Bible. Working quietly and openly among the easy things of the Christian life, the apostle suddenly plunges (18-20) out of sight into a subject of the most difficult nature. **Finally**—indicative not of the termination of the Epistle, but of a purpose to avoid further particulars, and to utter thoughts of a general nature. **All**—every individual of every class named. What follows is expressed by means of five adjectives, no other word being used. It is a beautiful cluster of virtues—*united, sympathetic, brotherly, compassionate, humble;* or, using the more active form—*like-minded, sympathizing, brother-loving, tender-hearted, lowly-minded.* **Like-minded** refers more to feeling than to opinion, yet union of heart tends to create greater union of opinion. Opinions, however unlike, ought not to bristle with prejudice. Christendom has long needed more oneness of doctrine, but much more has it needed oneness of heart. Even true churches have always needed this divine exhortation (Rom. 12: 16; 15: 5; 2 Cor. 13: 11; Phil. 2: 2; 1 Cor. 1: 10; Eph. 4: 3); how much more has Christendom needed it! Making infants church members in the early ages of Christianity at length filled churches with unregenerate persons, and the practice continuing to the present day, doctrines and rites have been forced upon men by assemblies, councils, emperors, popes, and legislatures, concerning which the Scriptures say nothing whatever. The divisions of Christendom are the progeny, not of Christianity, but of the world. **Having compassion**—*sympathizing, sympathy*—brought into our language from the Greek, is *feeling with.* The readers are dissimilar, socially and intellectually, yet each is required to make the joys, and espe-

one of another; love as brethren, *be* pitiful, *be* courteous:
9 Not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing: but contrariwise blessing; knowing that ye are thereunto called, that ye should inherit a blessing.
10 For he that will love life, and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips that they speak no guile:
11 Let him eschew evil, and do good; let him seek peace, and ensue it.

9 ing as brethren, tenderhearted, humbleminded: not rendering evil for evil, or reviling for reviling; but contrariwise blessing; for hereunto were ye called,
10 that ye should inherit a blessing. For,
He that would love life,
And see good days,
Let him refrain his tongue from evil,
And his lips that they speak no guile:
11 And let him turn away from evil, and do good;
Let him seek peace, and pursue it.

cially the sorrows of others, his own. (Rom. 12: 15; 1 Cor. 12: 26; Heb. 13: 3.)

So two, together weeping, make one woe.

Sympathy is a rational emotion; may be much developed; and, though often moving with great rapidity, may become, under the influence of the moral judgment enlightened by the Scriptures, a permanent power, bearing the soul forward with planet-like order through the entire course of life. Mock suffering (the theatre) and suffering described (fiction) are but feeble stimulants to sympathy. Tears may be wasted when sympathy is hoarded. **Love as brethern**—*brotherly*, in the Greek, *philadelphoi*. A philadelphian is a lover of his brethren. (1: 22; 4: 8; Rom. 12: 10.) The English, *love as brethren*, may leave an erroneous impression. **Pitiful**—*tender-hearted*, so translated in Eph. 4: 32. **Courteous.** This stands for a word which has much less manuscript authority than another, which is properly rendered as above, *lowly-minded*. The trait is to be manifested toward one another (5: 5; Phil. 2: 3), and especially toward God. (5: 6; Acts 20: 19.) The opposite is self-conceit, which is self-esteem with its eyes shut against God. The wolf may dwell with the lamb, but self-conceit with humility never.

9. The previous verse refers to their relations to each other, this to their relations to the unregenerate world; yet the virtues enjoined in ver. 8 have an anticipatory reference to what was about to be said concerning their relations to the world. **Evil for evil**—evil deeds; **railing**—words. Peter knows that his Lord did neither (Matt. 26: 62, 63; 27: 12); and he remembers what a wrong use he himself once made of the sword. (Matt. 26: 51.) **But contrariwise**—*on the contrary*. Do directly the opposite, and talk directly the opposite. Implore **blessing** upon them, bodily and spiritual, temporal and eternal. Wonderful precepts! and with the strength of Christ as easily obeyed as any others, if one has the lowliness of mind enjoined at the close of ver. 8. Pride is the spur of retaliation. **Knowing.** The Greek has little reason for being accepted as genuine. Read thus: *Because to this end ye were called, that ye should inherit blessing*; that ye should come into possession of the blessings of the gospel provided for this life and the next. They were called (2: 21) by the Holy Spirit. If they are possessors of such blessings, surely they ought to implore blessings on those who maltreat and malign them.

10. The Old Testament (Ps. 34: 12-16) again lends its aid to the apostle of the New, for the purpose of strengthening the exhortations of ver. 9. The usuul form of quotation is wanting, yet with slight variations the words are those of David, as reproduced in the Septuagint. **For** is Peter's, and connects the quotation with the preceding verse. **He that will love life.** 'Will' is not the usual auxiliary sign of the future. Read: *He that desires to love life*; or, *that would*. It takes for granted that life may be one of true happiness. The thought is peculiar. It is Peter's rather than David's; for David says: "He that desireth life." Peter gives prominence to *loving* life. The pessimist, if consistent, hates life. **To see good days** is to experience them—that is, to have them and enjoy them. Notice the use of the word in Luke 2: 26; Heb. 11: 5; John 3: 3. 'Good days,' in this life—the possession of none but believers. Even the sorrow of those who love God cannot make good days bad days. (Rom. 8: 28; 2 Cor. 4: 16; 6: 10.) **Let him refrain,** etc.—as if it were impossible to desire to love life, if the tongue were allowed to have its way. See James 3. **Guile,** *deceit*. See on 2: 1, 22.

11. Eschew, etc.—*turn away from evil*. It is a general, comprehensive precept, referring to evil of whatever kind. **And do good**, also a comprehensive precept, but it enjoins a positive virtue. "Went about doing

12 For the eyes of the Lord *are* over the righteous, and his ears *are open* unto their prayers: but the face of the Lord *is* against them that do evil.
13 And who *is* he that will harm you, if ye be followers of that which is good?
14 But and if ye suffer for righteousness' sake, happy *are ye:* and be not afraid of their terror, neither be troubled;
15 But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and *be*

12 For the eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous
And his ears unto their supplication:
But the face of the Lord is upon them that do evil.
13 And who is he that will harm you, if ye be zeal-
14 ous of that which is good? But and if ye should suffer for righteousness' sake, blessed *are ye:* and
15 fear not their fear, neither be troubled; but sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord: *being* ready always to

good," was said of Christ by this very apostle. (Acts 10: 38.) The farmer who merely abstains from sowing bad seed will reap nothing. **Seek peace**—a more particular direction. See Matt. 5: 9. To live peaceably in heaven with all will be easy; to live so here with all is scarcely possible (Rom. 12: 18); yet we are not only to seek peace, but we are to **ensue** (*pursue*) it. We are to make a vigorous and determined effort to make others peaceable and peaceful, and this is most easily done by being peaceable and peaceful ourselves. Much freedom must be granted to one another to do the usual work of life in the way preferred—in the family for example, and in the place of business, if peace is to thrive. There is no better trade to which to put a child than peace-making. In affairs moral and religious, we must be "first pure, then peaceable" (James 3: 17), yet persecution for religious opinions, even in the mild form of uncharitableness, is utterly contrary to the spirit of Christ.

12. For. This, too, is Peter's word, not David's. It points to the ground upon which the exhortations of ver. 11 rest—namely, the Lord's relation to the righteous and the wicked. **Are over**—*are upon;* that is, turned upon. **Unto their prayers**—*toward* them. 'Against,' 'upon'—the same word in the Greek as stands before the word for *righteous.* The contrast, then, between the Lord's course toward the righteous and toward the wicked is not expressed in the preposition, nor in *face.* The contrast is expressed by **but**—and the contrast how great! **Lord.** As nothing in the context requires it to be applied to Christ, it may have the reference which it has in the Psalm from which the words are taken.

13. Intensity is given to the thought by the interrogative form. Peter once had sharp experience of the power of questions. (John 21: 1-17.) The apostle would here confirm the exhortation to do good. **Will harm**—too feeble. The rendering is stronger in Acts 7: 6, 19 (*entreat evil, evil entreated*); in 12: 1 (*vex*); in 18: 10 (*to hurt thee*). **Followers**—*imitators.* But valuable manuscripts have a word which means *zealous—if ye are zealous of that which is good.* There are two possible meanings of the first part of the question: Who is he that will be *able* to do you evil? and, Who is he that will be *disposed* to do you evil? If the latter is the meaning, the question must have been asked in view of the supposition that usually the world will not be disposed to persecute those who lead a truly Christian life; but it can scarcely be said that in apostolic times this was usually the case. If the former is the sense, it implies that no one can do them any real and essential evil. God will parry the blow. Which is the correct view is uncertain. See Isa. 50: 9; Rom. 8: 31, 33, 34.

14. But and if—a "barbarous" translation (Lillie), an "innocent archaism" (Schaff). The English Revisers, as the latter reminds us, naturally adhere to these archaisms. Read: *But if also ye should suffer.* **For righteousness' sake**—on account of their Christian life. See *righteous* in ver. 12, *a good conscience and good conversation* in ver. 16, and *well doing* in ver. 17. **Happy**—*blessed,* which is less suggestive of hap, luck, chance. 'Happy' has taken on a Christian meaning, but even now it has less aroma than *blessed.* The sentiment which Peter here expresses fell upon his ear from the lips of Christ when upon the Mount (Matt. 5: 11.) Persecution will make these Christians more blessed here, and this fragrant result of suffering will extend into the next life, never to be diminished but ever to be augmented. **Be not afraid of their terror**—*fear not their fear;* be not afraid of the terror with which they would harass you. See on ver. 6. These words and the first clause in ver. 15 may be a "free translation" of Isa. 8: 12, 13.

15. But sanctify—*reverence as holy.* Compare "Hallowed be thy name." (Matt. 6: 9.) **The Lord God**—*Lord the Christ;* or perhaps better, *the Christ as Lord,* according to the approved reading. The exhortation stands

ready always to *give* an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear:
16 Having a good conscience; that, whereas they speak evil of you, as of evil doers, they may be ashamed that falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ.
17 For *it is* better, if the will of God be so, that ye suffer for well doing, than for evil doing.

give answer to every man that asketh you a reason concerning the hope that is in you, yet with meek-
16 ness and fear: having a good conscience; that, where-in ye are spoken against, they may be put to shame
17 who revile your good manner of life in Christ. For it is better, if the will of God should so will, that
18 ye suffer for well-doing than for evil-doing. Be-

in contrast with the one immediately preceding: Fear not *them*, but fear *as holy the Christ as Lord*. Isa. 8: 13 is literally: "Sanctify Jehovah of hosts." For *Jehovah* Peter uses *Lord*. Thus the apostle enjoins the duty of sanctifying Christ as Jehovah, which *may* be a proof of Christ's Deity. Had Peter, at an earlier period, had more reverence for the Lord, he would not have feared men, and denied him. Compare Matt. 10: 28. He has been qualified by bitter experience to exhort others. Fearing God makes one superior to the fear of men. Some fear the world even when the world bears no sword. **In your hearts**—otherwise there is no reverence. **And be ready**—*being ready*. The Greek for 'and' is not genuine. They must not only reverence Christ *in the heart*, but must also be ready to make an *oral* expression. **To give an answer**—literally, *be ready for an apology*—that is, for a "defence" (Phil. 1: 7); "what clearing of yourselves" (2 Cor. 7: 11); "answer" (2 Tim. 4: 16.) The use of the word implies that those who are supposed to ask for the reason of their hope, ask with little sympathy, not to say with some opposition. (Ver. 14, 16.) The answer given is therefore of the nature of a defence. **Always**—never unprepared, never unwilling, never timid. **Every man**—without respect to his position or his character. **A reason of**—a reason *concerning*. **The hope**—the hope in Christ, with all the blessed results. See on 1: 3, 13, 21. Be ready to make as full a statement as the circumstances may require. As they are to be always ready to do it, it follows that the reference is not specially to the first profession of faith. Lips which opened then, but never afterward, would seem to have opened mechanically, not under the sweet influence of a renewed heart. Too many are like the silent letters of our language—nothing would be lost if they were all dropped out. **With meekness**, etc. In several manuscripts the Greek is preceded by a word meaning *but* or *yet*, which makes the contrast more striking. They must be ready with a defence, *but* the defence must be made in the right spirit. They must avoid the appearance of arrogance, and must fear lest their defence be such as to do more harm than good.

16. Having a good conscience. This connects with 'ready.' (ver. 15.) A good conscience is a conscience unstained with conscious guilt, or with unforgiven sin, or with intention to do wrong. It implies that the conscience has been made white through faith in Christ. Without a good conscience, their readiness for defence would be false. **That whereas,** *wherein*, or, in the matter in which. It is similar to the form of expression in 2: 12, upon which see note. **Your good conversation in Christ**—*good manner of life in communion with Christ*. **Be ashamed**—desirable even if nothing more should come from it. Oh, that the consciences of all were so pure that the accusations were false and the accusers ashamed!

17. For. In ver. 16 the apostle virtually exhorts them to have a good conscience, and now he gives a reason in support of the exhortation. **If the will of God be so,** literally, *if the will of God should will it*. The noun refers to the will of God as a faculty, and the verb to exerting the faculty. 'The will of God' refers to the suffering. The form of the verb implies the *possibility* that such may be God's will. Should it be his will that you suffer at all, it is better to suffer for the reason that you do well than for the reason that you do ill. See 2: 20 and comments. **Better**—more for the honor of Christ, better for yourselves, for such suffering will bring the usual blessed result—sanctification. Or, let *better* be explained by 2: 19–21.

18–20. THE DESCENT OF CHRIST TO HELL. Such is the title which a large majority of interpreters, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, would prefix to this section, with what reason may appear after examination. No passage in the New Testament, none perhaps in the Bible, has been considered during at least fourteen hundred years more difficult. The main statement, with the subordinate

18 For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the
just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being
put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit:
19 By which also he went and preached unto the
spirits in prison;

cause Christ also [1] suffered for sins once, the right-
eous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us
to God; being put to death in the flesh, but quick-
19 ened in the spirit; in which also he went and

1 Many ancient authorities read *died*.

clauses, has received almost innumerable explanations. Many of the people, while disinclined to accept the view that Christ, in the interval between his death and resurrection, descended to the abode of lost spirits and preached to them, yet have been so bewildered by what Peter is made by our translators and many of the expositors to say, that they have settled down in despair of ever arriving at a satisfactory view. The meaning is made no plainer by the Revised Version. Some of the reasons for the interpretation about to be given will be found in the Critical Note.

For, *because.* It indicates that the apostle is to give a reason for something, and that something is implied in ver. 17—namely, the duty of bearing up under suffering in well-doing. This duty is urged by two considerations: 1. Christ suffered; 2. He preached to wrong-doers. The wrong-doing is set in a stronger light by presentation of the circumstances under which it continued to be committed. To preach to such men required long-suffering. **Also** is to be connected with *suffered for sins.* Notice the striking contrast between their suffering for well-doing and Christ's suffering for sins. The appeal, which is from the greater to the less, is one of incomparable strength. **For sins,** *on account of sins.* **Once.** It implies only once. See Heb. 9: 26, 28; Rom. 6: 9, 10. It may be referred to the entire period of his earthly suffering, but the context shows that the apostle was thinking chiefly of his final sufferings. **The just for the unjust,** *the righteous for the unrighteous.* **Hath suffered,** should be *suffered*, for Peter refers to what occurred and was completed at some previous time. Some manuscripts give another reading, which means *died*, and this is put in the margin of the Revised Version. Many critics prefer it. 'For' the unjust. See Critical Note on the same preposition in 2: 21. The idea of substitution is clearly indicated in the context, even if it is not expressed in the preposition itself. **That he might bring us to God.** Men are separated from God—that is, they are in want of that life which consists of communion with God. So far, then, as respects themselves, the object of Christ's suffering is to restore them to God's life—that is, to bring them into constant communion with their Creator. The verb implies very near approach to God. The scientific saying, *Omne vivum ex vivo* (*all life comes from life*) fails of verification in man viewed as a being of spiritual capacities; for in man there is no life to generate life. See Eph. 2: 5 ("when we were *dead* . . . *quickened* us"). "The spiritual life is the gift of the living Spirit." (Drummond, "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," *Biogenesis.*) **Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit;** *in spirit* is the more correct rendering. The meaning is not, that flesh as mere flesh died, and that the spirit as mere spirit was made alive, but that the death of Christ was the death of Christ in flesh, and that the quickening of Christ was the quickening of Christ in spirit. The Common Version, *by the Spirit* (as if there were allusion to the Holy Spirit), is here wrong. In the Greek the contrast is more strongly expressed. See Rom. 1: 3, 4; 1 Tim. 3: 16. As pre-existent, Jesus Christ was glorious in his "spiritual essence," but through all his earthly life that glory was partly veiled in flesh, and in flesh he was put to death. But at his resurrection, (compare ver. 21) he was quickened *in spirit*—that is, he came into repossession of the glory of his spiritual nature. That this quickening in spirit occurred at the resurrection, not between the death and the resurrection, is clear from Rom. 1: 4. How, then, could Christ be said to have gone *in* that spirit (ver. 19) to the abode of the lost between his death and his resurrection? But whether he went at all is to be seen chiefly in ver. 19, 20.

19. By which—*in which* spiritual nature. **Also**—not, as Lange and some others, *even.* It looks back to the *also* of ver. 18, thus: Because Christ *also* suffered, etc. (the one fact); he *also* preached (the other fact). These two facts are reasons why the readers should bear up under suffering in well-doing.

20 Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while

20 preached unto the spirits in prison, who aforetime were disobedient, when the longsuffering of

He went, etc. Translate the remainder of the verse and the first clause of ver. 20, not as in the Revised Version, but, *he went and preached to the spirits in prison when formerly they were disobedient.* Those who heard the preaching, heard it when they were living in disobedience. They rejected the preaching, were lost (ver. 20, last clause; 2 Pet. 2: 5), and now, while Peter is writing, are in prison, disembodied, and are therefore spoken of as spirits. **In prison.** See Rev. 20: 7; Matt. 5: 25. The word is of frequent occurrence in the New Testament, and means *a place of confinement.* Here it means the place in which the wicked are punished after death. It is very necessary to the correct understanding of this passage, to notice that the word does not express the idea which the ancient classics attached to *hades.* and the ancient Hebrews, sometimes, to *sheol*—namely, the place of disembodied spirits, good and bad. The conception of such a place is entirely foreign to the New Testament. In the New Testament, hades is the place in which the wicked are punished (Luke 16: 23); in the Common Version, *hell,* transferred in the Revised Version, *hades.* The good are not there. They are in heaven, called, in three instances, *paradise.* (Luke 23: 43; 2 Cor. 12: 14; Rev. 2: 7.) Jesus died before the robbers. (John 19: 32, 33.) Those who affirm that Christ went to hades—*descended to hell* (the phrase found in some of the most widely-accepted creeds), and there preached to the wicked, invariably imply that he went immediately. But if he went immediately, he must have torn himself from his *impenitent* hearers just as their attention was becoming aroused, in order to fulfill his promise by meeting a *penitent* in paradise. The contradiction between the words of Jesus (Luke 23: 43), "Verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise," and the representation made by Peter, *as commonly explained,* is complete. Christ could not have been with the saved robber in Paradise, and, at the same time, with the lost antediluvians in "hell." A very remarkable attempt has recently been made[1] by Dr. Davidson, of London, to save Peter as witness to a second probation for the antediluvians, by denying the authenticity of the words in Luke. The denial is based upon the one fact that the words were wanting in the copy used by Marcion, a heretic; and though admitting that Epiphanius says that Marcion "cut them off," Dr. Davidson will not admit that Epiphanius is in this to be believed. The scholar may do well to consult the Critical Apparatus in the Eighth Edition of Tischendorf's Greek Testament. Marcion took liberty with the text of Luke, which is not to be justified. ("Westcott on the Canon.") If the interpretation of Peter now to be given is correct, there is no contradiction between the apostle and the evangelist. But the question turns chiefly on the meaning of the next verse. **Preached.** The original word is not the word which means to preach the gospel; it is more general, meaning to *proclaim, to announce,* from which some have inferred that it was the preaching, not of glad tidings, but of condemnation. But the more general word is so often used to express the preaching of the gospel (Matt. 4: 17; 10: 7; 11: 1; Mark 1: 38), that this may be its import here. **Went.** Great weight has been attached to this word in support of the view that Christ *went in person* to the prison of the lost. But the word does not necessarily imply personal locomotion. See Gen. 11: 5–7, and especially Eph. 2: 17. Such language would have been entirely admissible (for it would have been in harmony with the genius of the Greek tongue), had Peter desired to say that Christ brought himself into connection with the persons in question, either by his Spirit, or by means of some pious inhabitant of the earth.

20. Which sometime were disobedient —*when formerly they were disobedient.* See the translation above and Critical Notes. The preaching occurred at the time of the disobedience, not thousands of years afterward. That it occurred long after the disobedient were swept away has been taught by the majority of expositors, including some recent distinguished interpreters of Germany. The common view is held in most remarkable disregard of the construction of the Greek.

[1] See *The Christian Register,* March 19, 1885.

the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water.

God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, [1] wherein few, that is, eight souls, 21 were saved through water: which also [2] after a true

1 Or, *into which few, that is, eight souls, were brought safely through water*.....2 Or, *in the antitype*.

In the next two clauses, Peter makes a more distinct statement of time and persons. **Once.** For this the Greek has scarcely any manuscript authority. **When the long suffering of God,** etc. The spirits who were in prison when Peter was writing these words were persons who lived their earthly life in the days of Noah. God's forbearance toward sinners is often mentioned in the Scriptures—*e. g.*, Rom. 2: 4; 9: 22; and here much vividness is added to the description by **waited,** especially in the original, where the word for *waited* is intense, *to wait out, to wait long for.* God waited one hundred and twenty years (Gen. 6: 3), not, as some say, seven days. (Gen. 7: 4.) "This sentence, as we may gather from the context, was made known to Noah in his four hundred and eightieth year, to be published by him as a 'preacher of righteousness' (2 Pet. 2: 5) to the degenerate race." (Keil.) He was six hundred years old when the flood came. What long suffering does God still manifest in waiting for the repentance of sinners! **While the ark was a preparing**—*an ark being in the process of building.* Here the time of the long suffering is very exactly given. Every blow of the ax and the hammer was a call to repentance. 'Ark.' Gen. 6: 14–16. See Matt. 24: 38; Luke 17: 27; Heb. 11: 7. **Wherein**—*in which,* though strictly the original preposition is such as to imply that they first *went into* it. **That is, eight**—a tragical explanation! **Souls.** In most cases this word is not a mere equivalent for a personal pronoun—*e. g.*, "And I will very gladly spend and be spent for your souls" (Common Version, *for you,* 2 Cor. 12: 15), but the word gives prominence to their spiritual nature as that which was the chief subject of regeneration. The use of the word *soul* instead of *you* contributes to vivacity. (Winer.) The verse before us, however, is one of the few in which the Greek for *souls* may have no special significance, in which it is equivalent, that is, to persons. 'Eight.' (Gen. 7: 7.) **Saved by**—*through, by means of.* In the margin of the Revised Version is the alternative rendering—*into which few, that is, eight souls, were brought safely through water.* But in the next verse the apostle represents water, in baptism, as saving us, and therefore, if the contrast is to be deemed pertinent, it was water through which, *by means of which,* Noah and his family were saved. But how could they be said to be saved by means of *water?* Was not the *ark* the means? Notice again the preposition (εἰς)—*into* which few (*going*) were saved by means of water. The apostle associates the idea of *going into* the ark with the idea of *being saved by water.* It is impossible to separate the one idea from the other, though, if we make the mistake of interpreting according to the mere letter, we shall say that only the water without its relation to the act of *going into* the ark was the means of their being saved. But *from what* were they saved? Clearly, that from which all the others were *not* saved—that is, from perishing, from death. They were indeed delivered from the prevailing corruption, but this is not the fact here intended. The *infants* that perished by drowning were as truly saved from the prevailing corruption as the "eight." Punishment (in the case of all but the infants) did indeed follow the drowning, but the first and palpable fact is that they perished by loss of life. Noah and his family were saved. They continued to live. Farrar hits in this case nearer than he sometimes does, for he says: "Perhaps this means 'by water as an instrument'—*i. e.*, because the water floated the ark."

Thus we learn that those to whom Christ preached were the unbelieving people of Noah's time. But *how* did he preach? That is a question of little importance, and one on which the interpretation of the passage as a whole ought not in any degree to be made to turn. Peter himself does not answer it, yet Christ may have preached through Noah's preaching, for *the Spirit of Christ* was in the prophets, and testified, etc. (1: 11.) Or he may have preached by an influence exerted more directly upon their minds. See John 1: 4. 5 for proof that before the incarnation the Word was in the world, and wrought upon the souls of men. [See note on John 1: 4, 5 for

a slightly different view.—A. H.] Those words show that whatever light the antediluvians had, came from Christ before he became flesh. Yet the preaching was more than the general influence of the word upon men before his incarnation.

21. The water by which Noah was saved suggests to Peter the water of baptism. The meaning of the accepted Greek is, *which* (water), *as an antitype* (as something resembling it, as a like figure), *is now saving you also—namely, baptism. Antitype* may not imply that the flood was a type of baptism in the usual sense of the word *type.* It may express only the idea of resemblance to the flood. As water saved Noah, so baptism is now saving you. *You* is the rendering of the genuine Greek. But what is meant by baptism saving them? There are a few passages in the New Testament which seem to teach, like this, that baptism precedes in the order of time forgiveness, regeneration, salvation. On the other hand, there are many passages which certainly do teach that baptism must not precede, but follow. To the latter class belong, for example, Matt. 3: 6–8; 28: 19, 20; Mark 16: 16; Acts 2: 41 (presenting an argument of cumulative force, because the number of cases in which baptism followed the spiritual change was three thousand); 8: 12; 8: 30–39; 9: 17, 18; 10: 43–48; 16: 14, 15, 29–34. Besides these and other proof-texts, the general spirit of the New Testament implies that baptism is preceded by regeneration. The chief passages which seem to teach the precedence of baptism, or, as some would say, regeneration or forgiveness of sin *in* baptism, are, besides the one before us, the following: "Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit"—more exactly, of water and the Spirit (John 3: 5); "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord" (Acts 22: 16); "Repent and be baptized, every one of you . . . for the remission of sins." (Acts 2: 38.) Ought these special exceptions to the general rule to govern the interpretation of the very numerous passages above cited, or ought the many passages to govern the interpretation of these few? If the latter, then the few passages cannot mean that water-baptism is a condition of baptism by the Spirit, and the doctrine that men must be baptized in order to be born again is unscriptural. Equally unscriptural, therefore, is the view that regeneration cannot be expected to occur "on the sea or in the chamber, on the highway or in the field, in the mill, the shop, or the store"—"at any point of time in man's life." After coming to a result by this general law of *interpreting the few passages by the many*, one may examine each of the few passages in detail, and it will be seen that not one of them teaches the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, so strongly pronounced by Professor Adams to be the "keystone of the arch" of all the Christian doctrines, including even "the atonement of our blessed Redeemer."[1]

Administered as it always ought to be, in its primitive form, baptism is a vivid reproduction in figure, in symbol, of the great FACT, *already accomplished*, that the soul, having been regenerated by the Spirit of God, has been buried to sin and been raised to holiness; and a vivid representation in figure, in symbol, of the twofold EVENT, yet future, the burial and resurrection of the body, the latter guaranteed by the resurrection of Christ. The figurative representation of the *bodily* change is so vivid, that the change seems by faith to be occurring *now*—that is, in the very act of being baptized; and the figurative reproduction of the *spiritual* change is so vivid that this change also seems by faith to be brought forward to the same point. One might as truly say, therefore, with Christ, *Ye must be born of water and the Spirit;* or, with Ananias, *Be baptized, and wash away thy sins;* or, with Peter, *The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us*—as to say, *Believe, and be baptized.* The latter direction is plain—not figurative, not symbolic, and therefore it expresses exactly *the time-relation of faith and baptism;* the former directions are not plain, but are symbolic, figurative, and therefore the exact *time-relation is not given.* Thus the interpretation of the few, and, it may be added,

[1] Prof. Wm. Adams, of the Episcopal Church ("Regeneration in Baptism").

[2] For an explanation of the passages supposed to teach baptismal regeneration, the reader is referred to the Appendix to the Commentary on the Gospel of John.—A. H.

21 The like figure whereunto *even* baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ:

likeness doth now save you, *even* baptism, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the [1]interrogation of a good conscience toward God, through
22 the resurrection of Jesus Christ; who is on the right

1 Or, *inquiry*; or, *appeal.*

obscure, passages by the many, concerning which there is no obscurity whatever, is justified. Baptism, then, is the symbolic representation of what literally took place before. "*It pictures in the present* what has been experienced in the past. . . . The past is presented again emblematically in baptism, as if it were present." (President A. Hovey.) Coming "to the baptismal font," the soul "comes to ratify in the appointed way its own previous act of surrender." (Lillie.) Thus, not more necessary is it here than in the other passages with which it has been classed to see the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. **Save us** (*you*), as well as Noah and his family. **Now** contrasts the present time with that of Noah. **Doth save**—not, *saved*, or *will save.* The present may here be used to express the general fact that baptism saves; or, it may denote continuance of action, *is saving you.* In the latter case, it denotes the spiritual influence of baptism continued through life. Such continued influence will be greater or less, according to one's clearness of spiritual perception. It is to be feared that with many persons it is painfully small.

Baptism. The act denoted by this word is an immersion of the entire body. As regeneration had respect to the *entire* man, as the entire man in regeneration is buried to sin and is raised to holiness, and as the bodies of the regenerate are to be buried and to be raised from the grave, the rite is beautifully and wonderfully expressive. (Rom. 6: 3, 4; Col. 2: 12.) "And how, as for a moment the prostrate form of the disciple disappears beneath the wave, is the whole solemn story of our death in Christ silently rehearsed!" (Dr. A. J. Gordon, "In Christ.") "There can be no doubt," says Dean Goulburn of the Episcopal Church, "that baptism, when administered in the primitive and most correct form, is a divinely constituted emblem of bodily resurrection."

Not the putting away, etc.—a definition, first negative then positive, of what baptism is. Heb. 9: 10, 13 makes it not improbable, that Peter had Jewish ceremonials in his eye. In any case, baptism as such has no effect in improving the outward man, though millions have been taught to think otherwise. **But the answer,** etc. The difficulties of the passage pertain chiefly to the word translated *answer.* It is certain that this translation is incorrect, but as the word occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, scholars are not agreed as to its meaning. The Revisers show their own uncertainty by translating "interrogation," and putting in the margin, "Or, *inquiry*, or *appeal.*" *Question, request, inquiry, seeking after, asking,* are the chief meanings assigned. It is also queried whether the 'good conscience' is already the possession of him who requests or whether it is the object of the request. Some translate: *The inquiry of a good conscience after God;* some, *the question directed to God for a good conscience;* some, *the asking of a good conscience,* meaning, *the asking in which we address God with a good conscience,* our sins being forgiven and renounced; some, *the stipulation* (promise) *toward God of a good conscience.* It is clear that with such variety of translation, positiveness relative to the meaning would be unseemly. On the whole, *inquiry* or *requirement* is perhaps the best rendering: *Baptism is the requirement of a good conscience toward God.* Baptism is something which a conscience, made sensitive and pure relative to the will of God requires, or, something concerning which it makes inquiry. **A good conscience** is a conscience sprinkled with the blood of Christ and also purified by the Spirit. (Heb. 9: 14; 10: 2, 22.) It is such a conscience which makes request. It became such before baptism, which implies that the subject had already been regenerated. **By the resurrection of Jesus Christ.** *Through* is here better than *by.* Connect with *saves* and notice its relation to *quickened in spirit.* (Ver. 18.) It gives the means by which baptism is made symbolically so efficacious. See 1: 3. There seems to be a silent reference to Christ's death. All turns on the question whether Christ rose from the dead. (1 Cor. 15: 14-17.)

Before leaving this part of the chapter, a

22 Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.

hand of God, having gone into heaven; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.

brief quotation from Dean Stanley's "Christian Institution" (Chap. I., "Baptism"), may not be amiss: "Baptism was not only a bath, but a plunge—an entire submersion in the deep water, a leap as into the rolling sea or the rushing river, where, for the moment, the waves close over the bather's head, and he emerges again as from a momentary grave. . . . This was the part of the ceremony on which the apostles laid so much stress. It seemed to them like a burial of the old former self and the rising again of the new life. . . . The essence of the material form is gone. There is now no disappearance as in a watery grave. . . . It is but the few drops sprinkled." Saddening as is the departure from apostolic practice, by which a "human invention" (Dean Stanley) has been introduced into the Christian world in place of that which God requires, the Dean expresses himself with entirely too great positiveness, since the apostolic act of baptism is retained throughout the large Greek Church, and is practiced by a great company of believers in the United States, by many in England, and many in other countries, and is pretty rapidly working its way into nearly all the evangelical churches of Christendom.

22. The ascension of Christ, hitherto implied (1: 21), is now affirmed. Thus, in this unique passage (18-22) has the apostle swept from the spiritual activity of the unincarnated Word, in the earlier period of human history, through the deep vale of earthly suffering, to the triumphal appearance on the mediatorial throne. The Sufferer is Sufferer no more. The groundwork of appeal to suffering Christians is complete. **Who is gone into heaven,** etc.—*who is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven,* is more exact, as in the Revised Version. (Rom. 8: 34; Mark 16: 19; Heb. 1: 3; Col. 3: 1.) To sit on God's right hand is a peculiar honor granted to Jesus Christ. See Ps. 110: 1, quoted by our apostle in his discourse on the Day of Pentecost. (Acts 2: 34, 35.) "Supreme dominion is most clearly meant"; "his being seated on the mediatorial throne as the result and reward of his sufferings"; "the sacred writers never speak respecting the Logos (Word, John 1: 1) considered simply in his *divine* nature, as being seated at the right hand of God; but only of the Logos *incarnate*, or the Mediator, as being seated there." (Stuart on "Hebrews," p. 559, 1833.) See Hackett, "Acts" (belonging to the present Series), 2: 34, who makes an ampler quotation from Stuart. **Angels and authorities and powers**—not any class of human beings, whether on earth or in heaven, but heavenly beings. Of their difference and employments we know little. But see Heb. 1: 14. The three classes may be mentioned in the order of their rank; their rank may be the same. We may know more of them hereafter. More study of God and less inquisitiveness concerning angels would have made some people wiser. Paul uses the same or similar words. See Eph. 1: 21; Col. 1: 16. However exalted the beings are, they are **made subject**—*are subjected* to Christ. Thus Christ as Mediator is over all. (Heb. 1; Col. 1: 18.)

CRITICAL NOTES.—CHAPTER III.

1. ἰδίοις is here, and in most other places, properly translated *your own*—that is, it expresses more emphasis than the Greek personal pronoun. Denied by Meyer; Fronmüller goes to the other extreme. Lillie takes the medium view, as Ellicott also on the parallel passage (Eph. 5: 22), the latter saying, "*Your own husbands*—those especially yours, whom feeling, therefore, as well as duty, must prompt you to obey. Compare 1 Pet. 3: 1. The pronominal adjective ἰδίοις ('*your own*') is clearly more than a possessive pronoun (De Wette), or, what is virtually the same, than a formal designation of the husband. . . . It seems rather both here, and in 1 Pet. 3: 1, to retain its proper force, and imply, by a latent antithesis, the *legitimacy* (compare John 4: 18), *exclusiveness* (1 Cor. 7: 2), and *specialty* (1 Cor. 14: 35) of the connection. . . . It may still be remarked that the use of ἰδίοις in later writers is such as to make us cautious how far in *all* cases in the New Testament (see Matt. 22: 5; John 1: 42), we press the usual meaning." It is not the classic way of expressing the possessive and reflexive sense, but it *is* the way of the New Testament writers.

20. The New Testament of the Bible Union, the Common Version, and the Revised Version, translate the words relative to preaching to the spirits in prison in essentially the same way. They all use a relative pronoun and a verb: *Which* (who) *were disobedient.* In the same way are the words translated by perhaps the majority. If this rendering is correct, there is no escape from the conclusion that Christ preached to the sinners of Noah's day two thousand years after they died. If the interpretation, which is now to be controverted and rejected is deemed to be necessary (and that is the plea) as a defense of the character of God, it would seem to be the duty of those who take that view to reconcile the hypothesis with the remarkable fact that God permitted those sinners to suffer *two thousand years* before using any means whatever to bring them to repentance. That two thousand years was a short period compared with eternity is not at all to the purpose. If giving them "another chance" was necessary as a vindication of divine goodness, it is impossible to see the justice of postponing the offer so long.

An examination of the construction, made by President S. C. Bartlett, appeared in the "New Englander," October, 1872. The subject is discussed in the "Bibliotheca Sacra," by Prof. Cowles, and in the "Presbyterian Quarterly," by Dr. Nathaniel West. Dr. Bartlett's article was examined, and its main position rejected, by Dr. W. W. Patton, in the "New Englander," July, 1882. To this President Bartlett rejoins in the "Bibliotheca Sacra" for April, 1883. It is important to see the points at issue. *Unto the spirits which were disobedient* (τοῖς πνεύμασιν ἀπειθήσασίν). Here is a noun with the article, followed by an aorist participle without the article. It is admitted that if the participle had the article, it could properly be translated with a relative pronoun and verb. Then antecedency of time would not be expressed, and Christ might have preached long after the disobedience. As the participle has no article, it cannot properly be translated *who were* disobedient. That the aorist participle without the article should be translated in some other way than by using the relative pronoun and the verb, is clear from the teachings of grammarians and from usage.

I. The grammarians are agreed in recognizing the aorist participle when connected with a verb as expressing what occurred before the action of the main verb, as Winer, Buttmann, Kühner, Goodwin, and many others. The grammarians more or less distinctly recognize also the difference between the aorist participle with the article and the aorist participle without the article. With much unanimity they teach, that with the article the participle is *attributive*—attributes some quality; and without the article is *predicative*—predicates or affirms something; and in the latter case, whatever else may be included, expresses *antecedency of time.*

II. Usage is very clear in support of these distinctions, and this must be the last ground of appeal. President Bartlett cites chiefly from Matthew. We may notice the usage in the Acts. "*When* they had fasted," *having* fasted (13:3) (aorist). "*When* Paul and his companions loosed they came"; or, as in the Revised Version: "Paul and his company set sail *and* came"; "*Having* put to sea they came." (13:13.) (Hackett.) In both cases the aorist was required, because the act preceded the act of the verb. Either of the three ways of rendering in the last instance expresses antecedency. "David, *having* served, *after* he had served, fell asleep." (13:36.) "The apostles, *having* heard, *having* sent, they ran in." (14:14.) The *hearing* and the *sending* took place before the running (aorist therefore). "Whom ye slew and hanged." (5:30.) Overlooking the aorist of the participle, the Common Version makes the Jews first to have slain Jesus, and then to have hanged him on a tree! Whom ye slew, *having* hanged him, or more freely, *by* hanging him. Many more cases could be cited from the Acts. This usage pervades the New Testament. President Bartlett has "counted more than a hundred in the first sixteen chapters of Matthew, all denoting preliminary action." Winer (§20, 1) cites 1 Pet. 5:10: "Peculiarly instructive," he says, "respecting the use and the omission of the articles with participles": "But the God of all grace, *who hath called us, after* that ye *have suffered* awhile." Here are both forms, a participle with the article (*attributive*), and therefore properly translated by means of a pronoun and a verb (*who hath called*); and a participle without the

CHAPTER IV.

FORASMUCH then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same

1 Forasmuch then as Christ suffered in the flesh,

article, and therefore correctly translated not with the pronoun but with some sign of time, as *when* or *after*. Were the three English Versions, already mentioned, as regardless of Greek usage here as they are in the verses before us, they would say, not *after* that ye have suffered, but *who* have suffered. Then we should have, *who called us who suffered*. But the apostle prays that the readers may be perfected, stablished, and strengthened, *after* they have escaped; hence the aorist participle without the article. The usage of the Greek language, then, as appears from these and very many other instances which might be cited, shows that the translation, unto the spirits *which were disobedient*, cannot be sustained. The Greek should be rendered in such a way as to show that the act expressed by the participle occurred before and at the time of the preaching, thus: He preached unto the spirits *when formerly they were disobedient;* or, "on their being once upon a time disobedient." The participle te ls us *when* Christ did the preaching—*when the sinning was done*, not thousands of years afterward. See additional confirmation of this view in a note in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," p. 2786, American edition, by Prof. Thayer.

"Probably," says President Bartlett, "the Vulgate (or, rather, Itala) is largely responsible for the acceptance of the common rendering; and it was facilitated by the doctrine of the descent into hades, which, at a later period, found its way into the 'Apostles' Creed,' and thus into the 'Articles of the Church of England,' the Lutheran 'Formula of Confession,' and even into Calvin's 'Institutes.' The theological bias of Christendom has favored the erroneous rendering." It is deeply to be regretted that the doctrine of Christ's "Descent to Hell" should still be taught as a doctrine of Scripture. See Huther, Fronmüller, with an Excursus by Dr. Mombert in the English translation, Farrar in "Early Days of Christianity," and many others. Farrar, with no examination, in the work cited, of the Greek construction, pronounces the doctrine of Christ's "Descent into Hades" ("Descent into *Hell*," three pages further on) as "inestimably precious," and complains of "the torturing of the passage and of the human perversity expended upon it." It is in support of the dogma of a second probation—that is, a probation after death—that fresh interest in the passage has recently been awakened in certain quarters in our own country; but, if the Greek bears the interpretation here most heartily accepted, that doctrine finds no countenance in this part of our Epistle. If there are any sinners to whom God grants a second probation, they are not such sinners as the contemporaries of Noah. These were giants in wickedness. They had light enough to make their guilt of awful dye. They were among the last persons to whom Peter would represent God as granting another probation; for mark carefully what he says in his Second Epistle. (2:5): "God *spared not* the old world, but saved (preserved) Noah, the eighth person, a *preacher of righteousness*, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly." See also what Christ himself says in Matt. 24: 38, 39.

> In religion,
> What damned error, but some sober brow
> Will bless it, and approve it with a text
> Hiding the grossness with ornament.

Ch. 4: 1-6. SECOND SERIES OF EXHORTATIONS (*continued*).

The exhortations arising from the relation of the Christians to persecutors are continued. Ver. 1 has general connection with the entire section (3: 18-22), but is closely related to ver. 18.

1. Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered—*Christ, then, having suffered*, is more literal. We have already been reminded by similar allusions, that Peter once repelled the thought that his Lord was to suffer, saying, "This shall not be unto thee." (Matt. 16: 22.) Four times since the opening of the Epistle has he given special prominence to the fact. (1: 11; 2: 21; 3: 18; 4: 1.) He had been instructed (Matt. 16: 21; Luke 9: 31), but his self-confidence was strong; and, besides, he held the opinion, then prevalent, that the Messiah, whenever he

mind: for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin;
2 That he no longer should live the rest of *his* time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God.
3 For the time past of *our* life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries:

arm ye yourselves also with the same [1] mind; for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased [2] from
2 sin; that [3] ye no longer should live the rest of your time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will
3 of God. For the time past may suffice to have wrought the desire of the Gentiles, and to have walked in lasciviousness, lusts, winebibbings, revel-
4 lings, carousings, and abominable idolatries: where-

1 Or, *thought*.....2 Some ancient authorities read *unto sins*.....3 Or, *he no longer . . . his time*.

might come, was not to die. His present convictions respecting the necessity of Christ's sufferings are as strong as Paul's. **In the flesh**—*as to the flesh*, in that state. Christ's death is included in the suffering. **Arm yourselves likewise**—*do ye also arm yourselves.* As ships and chariots were equipped for battle, so they *also* as well as Christ are to be morally furnished. **The same mind**—*same thought* or *disposition.* Christ had the disposition to suffer, and they must be equipped with the same. The disposition will be *as armor* in which to meet their persecutors. He who has no mind to suffer, who assumes that suffering is unnecessary, that so far as it springs from man it is even unjust, is like an unarmed man on the field of battle. Not seeking suffering as merit, but calmly awaiting it, is imitation of Christ! **For he that . . . from sin** has the nature of a parenthesis. It is to be referred, not to Christ, but to the Christian. He who with conscious reference to Christ's disposition to suffer, has himself suffered in the flesh, has been made to cease from sin (*sins*, Wescott and Hort), has been transferred from sin to holiness. Through suffering, sin has ceased to rule over him. [Does not the expression "suffered in the flesh" (ὁ παθὼν σαρκί) refer to death? The suffering of Christ just referred to was a suffering of death. The clause may be regarded as parenthetic.—A. H.] **For us** (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν) is to be rejected. *Hath ceased* (πέπαυται) may be taken in the passive sense: he *has rest* from sin, *is preserved* from sin.

2. That. Connect with 'arm yourselves.' The third person singular (*he*) is no reason why the clause may not be connected with one containing a word in the second person plural, for in the Greek there is no pronoun whatever. It may therefore be rendered as in Revised Version: That *ye* may no longer . . . *your* time. It assigns the *end* of the arming. **The rest**—an impressive hint that a part of their earthly life has gone beyond their control. **In the flesh.** It marks them as still being in this life. It is not used, as Paul often uses it, in the sense of *depraved nature.* **To the lusts**—*according to*, and lusts of the grosser kind. (Ver. 3, 4.) **To the will**—*according to.* How opposite these rules of life! so opposite that the former is not a rule; sin is defiance of all rule. Compare Eph. 2: 12; Gal. 5: 17; Rom. 6: 20. The obligation to live 'according to the will of God,' presupposes that will to be righteous. The contrast between men and God is as great as between lust and infinite purity. **No longer** holds a very emphatic position.

3. May suffice—a striking way of hinting that their former mode of life ought not to have existed at all, but it is also a rhetorical softening of the description. **Us.** This seems to class the writer himself with the others; but (1) it need not be supposed that *all* the readers, much less Peter, had been addicted to these different kinds of vice, and (2) the Greek for *us* is rejected as of little authority. **Will** (*desire*) **of the Gentiles**—a proof, say some, especially as they had been guilty of idolatry, from which the Jews had certainly become free, that the readers were Gentiles. It may be sufficient evidence that some of the readers were Gentiles, as other expressions are proof that some of them were Jews. 'The will of the Gentiles' and 'the will of God'—thoroughly antagonistic, and this fact is the foundation of missions. **Walked**—customary. **Lasciviousness.** The Greek of all the nouns is plural, which, perhaps, indicates the variety of the forms of evil. **Excess of wine.** The correct rendering is simply *wine-drinkings*, or, as in the Revised Version, *wine-bibbings.* **Revellings, banquetings**—*carousings*, riotings after supper, "the guests often sallying into the streets with torches, music, frolic, and songs in honor especially of Bacchus." **Abominable idolatries**—unlawful idol-worship, including the terrible immorality connected with it. It

4 Wherein they think it strange that ye run not with *them* to the same excess of riot, speaking evil of *you:*
5 Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead.

in they think it strange that ye run not with *them* into the same [1] excess of riot, speaking evil of *you:*
5 who shall give account to him that is ready to judge
6 the quick and the dead. For unto this end [2] was the

1 Or, *flood*,.....2 Or, *were the good tidings preached.*

was unlawful, for it was contrary to the will of God. Compare this description with that of Paul. (Rom. 1: 19-32.) Peter and Paul failed to make the discovery made by the sharp eyes of some modern religionists, that there is about as much truth at the bottom of idolatry as in Christianity. See Critical Notes.

4. Wherein. The original, being in the singular, it is difficult to refer this to the various vices with which it stands in such close relation. Some refer it to 'suffice' (ver. 3), and would express the meaning thus: *They think it strange that it suffices you to have wrought the will of the Gentiles.* Some refer it to what follows: **That ye run not with them,** etc. It may be referred to what precedes, taken as a whole, yet the prominent thought is that the unconverted Gentiles think strange, are surprised (the surprise manifesting itself in slander) at the change from such habits of wickedness to their present mode of life. The text gives a graphic description of the torrent-like excitability of men who are borne by their passions into evil. **To the same**—*into* the same. **Excess** (*flood*) **of riot**—outpouring of debauchery. It is a metaphor of great strength. The form of expression was doubtless drawn from what was observed in the rushing of flood-waters into excavations of the land. Their wicked neighbors and townsmen were amazed that they did not still rush with them into the outpourings or overflowings of debauchery. They slandered them for it. These are not the sins in which most Christians of modern times indulged before their conversion, and therefore they are not the sins into which they are in greatest danger of running with the ungodly. Running with the world is possible without running with it into the grosser evils. The more velvety forms of social sin are now, in Christian countries, the more dangerous. The life of God in the soul of man includes morality; but morality, and that of a high order, is possible without life.

5. Give account. An account (see on 3: 15) was sometimes demanded of Christians by men of the world, even by opposers; but these shall give account to Christ. A solemn sight will it be when all who rejected Christ and slandered his people are standing before the Judge, and are required to make a report of their manner of life and of their reasons for pursuing it. Matt. 12: 36. Compare Heb. 13: 17. **To him.** Christ is to be the Judge. (Acts 10: 42; 2 Tim. 4: 1.) Sometimes he is said to be the Being through whom God will judge. (Acts 17: 31.) **The quick and the dead**—those who are alive and those who are dead. Of course, it includes those who may be alive at Christ's second coming and all who may have died. Thus are meant all human beings whatsoever. **Ready.** Some explain this word by "the end of all things is at hand" (ver. 7), as if the readiness consisted in being about to do it, which is a good explanation on condition that the latter words are evidence that Peter was expecting the coming of Christ to be very near. But even without such reference the words are solemnly significant. Jesus Christ is ready by *personal qualification* to ascend the tribunal at any moment when the purposes of God relative to the salvation of men shall have been accomplished.

> Heaven is above all yet; there sits a judge
> That no king can corrupt.

6. It is sufficiently surprising that the Roman Catholic Church should here, as in 3: 19, 20, find purgatory, but it is more surprising that as there so here even some Protestant scholars should as easily find "Christ's Descent to Hell." Recently men of rationalistic and men of "broad church" views have been fired anew in support of the latter interpretation. If this passage teaches the doctrine of a second probation, the *Descent to Universalism* would seem to be less difficult. Their interpretation proceeds upon two unproved assumptions: 1. That God has no right to punish men who have never heard the gospel. But see Rom. 1: 19, 20. 2. That even those who may have heard and rejected, ought to have "another chance." Two more prelimi-

6 For, for this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit.

gospel preached even to the dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit.

nary remarks may be made: 1. That even if it were impossible, as perhaps it is, to arrive at entirely satisfactory results, it is certainly impossible to obtain from the text, by any process of interpretation which will not put it into contradiction to the teachings of Christ, and to other teachings of the apostles, the doctrine that Christ descended to hades to give the lost "another chance" to be saved. 2. The advocates of the "Descent" are utterly and hopelessly at variance among themselves relative to the object for which the "Descent" was made; whether to preach to the antediluvians who perished in the flood impenitent, or to those who perished repenting at the last moment; whether to all sinners of the ancient world, or to Old Testaments saints; and whether the object was to preach the gospel, or to preach condemnation.

For. It gives the verse a particular connection with 'to judge the quick and the dead,' and a general connection with the entire section beginning at ver. 1. There the exhortation is, to arm themselves with the same mind that Christ had—namely, the mind to suffer—a thought which lies with great weight upon the heart of the writer; for he knows that they have already suffered, and evidently believes that yet greater sufferings await them. In *this* verse he continues to encourage them. **For this cause**—*for to this end.* The end is introduced by '*that.*' **Also**—to those who are dead as well as to those who are still living. Some translate by *even;* preached *even to them* who are now dead. **Them that are dead**—more briefly and exactly, *to the dead.* The chief question here is, Who are meant by the dead? The dead spiritually? or the dead physically? The latter is clearly the meaning in the closing word of the previous verse, and this may lead us to presume that is the meaning here. But not all the dead are meant, for to many of the dead the gospel had never been preached. The reference is to *dead believers.* **That,** etc. All that follows, to the close of the verse, expresses the end for which the gospel was preached to those *now dead;* namely, **that they might be judged,** etc. But how could the gospel have been preached to them for such an end? The pertinency of the statement in the last clause is easily seen, but not the pertinency of what is said here. The difficulty may be removed by supposing that the sign used to express the end (*that*), passes over the former of the two clauses and connects itself only with the latter. Upon that view the meaning may be given thus: that though they might be judged according to men in the flesh, yet, etc. In support of this view may be adduced Rom. 6: 17: "But God be thanked that ye were (that *having once been*) the servants of sin, ye have obeyed," etc.

But in what sense might these now deceased Christians have been judged according to men in the flesh? Two different answers have been given: 1. Their death may be called a *judgment* or *condemnation,* since death comes upon all men, Christians not excepted, as condemnation for sin. 2. They may have been *judicially condemned to death*—martyrs. Though they may have been judged in the one way or in the other, yet the gospel was preached to them that they might *live according to God in the spirit.* **According to men**—after the manner of men. Thus the readers may be encouraged to bear up under their sufferings by the consideration that those who have already died, whether unjustly condemned by the judicial power, or adjudged to the death of the body in the ordinary course of nature—that they **live in . . the spirit.** The life was eternal; it was the life of the spirit; it was a divine life, for it was **according to God;** and the gospel was preached to them that that very end might be accomplished. The writer is far from confident that this interpretation of the most difficult passage in the Epistle is correct. He is not satisfied with any interpretation which he has seen; but, as it would conflict with a great multitude of passages, he is utterly unable to accept the explanation that the apostle teaches a second probation.

Ch. 4: 7-5: 9. Third Series of Exhortations.

This series pertains to their general church

7 But the end of all things is at hand: be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer.

7 But the end of all things is at hand: be ye there-

life. It is pervaded with deep solemnity, being tinged with thoughts in reference to the end of all things (ver. 7), the second coming of Christ (5: 4), and the judgment. (Ver. 17, 18.)

7. FIRST EXHORTATION. **But** does not contrast what follows with what precedes; it is rather an index to another line of thought. The verse contains a proposition and an exhortation; the exhortation being clothed in the form of an inference. To the proposition is given the prominent place, though, in fact, the exhortation is the main thing. **The end of all things.** See on 'the last time' (1: 5); on the appearing of Jesus Christ (1: 7); and also on 'the revelation of Jesus Christ' (1: 13). The words before us cannot possibly be referred to the time of each man's death. To what can they refer but to the supposed coming of Christ? **Is at hand**—more exactly, *has come near*. But in what sense do Peter and Paul and other apostles teach that the end of all things has come near? One view, which, perhaps, is the correct one, has been lucidly expressed by Hackett on Acts 3: 20. The importance of the subject will justify the quoting of almost the entire passage: "Nearly all critics understand this passage as referring to the return of Christ at the end of the world. The similarity of the language to that of other passages which announce that event demands this interpretation. The apostle enforces his exhortation to repent, by an appeal to the final coming of Christ, not because he would represent it as near in point of time, but because that event was always *near to the feelings and consciousness* of the first believers. It was the great consummation on which the strongest desires of their souls were fixed, to which their thoughts and hopes were habitually turned. They lived with reference to this event. They labored to be prepared for it. They were constantly, in the expressive language of Peter, *looking for and* (in their impatience as it were) *hastening the arrival of the day of God.* (2 Pet. 3: 12.) It is then that Christ will reveal himself in glory, will come "taking vengeance on them that know not the gospel," and "admired in all them that believe" (2 Thess. 1: 8, 10), will raise the dead (John 5: 28, 29), invest the redeemed with an incorruptible body (Phil. 3: 21), and introduce them for the first time, and forever, into the state of perfect holiness and happiness prepared for them in his kingdom. The apostles, as well as the first Christians in general, comprehended the grandeur of that occasion. It filled their circle of view, stood forth to their contemplations as the point of culminating interest in their own and the world's history; threw into comparative insignificance the present time, death, all intermediate events; and made them feel that the manifestation of Christ, with its consequences of indescribable moment to all true believers, was the grand object which they were to keep in view as the end of their toils, the commencement and perfection of their glorious immortality. In such a state of intimate sympathy with an event so habitually present to their thoughts, they derived, and must have derived, their chief incentives to action from the prospect of that future glory. As we should expect, they hold it up to the people of God to encourage them in affliction, to awaken them to fidelity, zeal, perseverance, and, on the other hand, appeal to it to warn the wicked and impress upon them the necessity of preparation for the revelation of the final day. For examples of this habit the reader may see Acts 17: 30, 31; 1 Tim. 6: 13, seq.; 2 Tim. 4: 8; Titus 2: 11, seq.; 2 Pet. 3: 11, seq., etc. Some have ascribed the frequency of such passages in the New Testament to a definite expectation on the part of the apostles, that the personal advent of Christ was nigh at hand; but such a view is not only unnecessary, in order to account for such references to the day of the Lord, but at variance with 2 Thess. 2: 2. The Apostle Paul declares there, that the expectation in question was unfounded, and that he himself did not entertain it or teach it to others. But while he corrects the opinion of those at Thessalonica, who imagined that the return of Christ was then near, neither he nor any other inspired writer has informed us how remote that event may be, or when it will take place."

[It is doubted by many whether Dr. Hackett's view of 2 Thess. 2: 2 is correct, though it is still defended by able scholars. Thus, the Revised Version by the Bible Union translates ἐνέστηκεν, *is at hand;* the Revised English Bible, *were close at hand;* Prof. Noyes,

8 And above all things have fervent charity among yourselves: for charity shall cover the multitude of sins.

fore of sound mind, and be sober unto [1]prayer: 8 above all things being fervent in your love among yourselves; for love covereth a multitude of sins:

1 Gr. *prayers.*

were close at hand. But Alford translates the word, *is come;* Ellicott, *is now come.* With the former agree Robinson in his Lexicon (s. v. ἐνίστημι) and Grimm, "Lexicon Græco-Latinum in Libros N. T." In favor of the view assumed by Dr. Hackett to be correct is the consideration that, according to 1 Thess. 4: 16, the advent of the Lord was to be in visible glory, and the Thessalonians could scarcely have supposed that he had thus come already. Or, if they had adopted so erroneous a view, it would have been most effectually refuted by assuring them that Christ's Presence was to be a visible one at his coming.—A. H.]

Be ye therefore sober. In view of the end be sober, of *sound mind.* It is opposed to erratic, insane views of things. Control yourselves in the use of the appetites and passions. **Watch.** See on the word *sober* (1: 13), where the original is the same as here. **Unto prayer**—*unto prayers.* 'Prayer' is to be connected with 'be sober' as well as with 'watch'; be sober unto prayers as well as watch unto prayers. 'Unto' indicates the *end* of the soberness and watchfulness; namely, 'prayers'; that is, they are to be in such a state of mind that the spirit of prayer shall be kept alive and be strengthened. The plural is no evidence of allusion to public written prayers. Compare Eph. 6: 18; Matt. 26: 41. Praying may precede watching, as watching may precede praying. The two cannot well be separated. Had Oliver Cromwell's army done all the praying which it is reported to have done, without any watching, its victories had been ignominious defeats. Yet watching without praying is almost sure to lead into some tempestuous Euroclydon. (Acts 27: 14.) Had Peter watched, not all the demons of perdition would have been able to make him deny Christ; had he prayed more, he would have watched more, and so would have remained steadfast. His exhortation was indeed prompted by an impressive view of Christ's second coming, yet his own sad fall must have made him conscious of a stronger impulse to give it.

8. Second Exhortation. It is more closely related to that of ver. 7 than it appears to be. Be sober and watch; **have,** rather, *having* **fervent charity.** *In connection with* sobriety and watchfulness have *charity* (*love*). **And** is to be rejected from the text. **Above all things.** But the love which is here set so high is mutual love, love to God not being mentioned. Love to one another is put not above love to God, but above all the duties which they owe to each other. Without mutual love, the churches of which they were members would be disintegrated or petrified. In either case, all other duties toward one another would go undone. The love must not be merely negative, only saving them from biting and devouring one another (Gal 5: 14, 15), but it must be 'fervent' (*intense*). See on 'fervently,' 1: 22. Compare 1 Cor. 13: 4–7; 14: 1. Such love should be *cultivated.* The true construction is: *Above all things having your love toward one another intense.* They are not exhorted to love, but to love with intensity. **For charity shall cover** (*covereth*) **the** (rather, *a*) **multitude of sins;** a reason given, enforcing the duty. Proverbs 10: 12, is: "Hatred stirreth up strifes; but love covereth all sins." The latter half is to be understood in the light of the former half, for they are in contrast. Hatred produces and inflames strife; love neither inflames nor produces sin; more than this, which is only negative, it keeps down sin, prevents it from rising; or, if it is rising, quenches it as a garment may smother an outbursting flame. Such being the meaning of the passage in Proverbs, this must be substantially the meaning here. 'A multitude.' One virtue may be more than a match for many sins, not in itself, but as nourished by the life of God, as, in the strictest sense, originating in that life. It is sin in another which is meant. Some Roman Catholic expositors deny this, and the denial is believed by some to be the natural offspring of extravagant views relative to personal merit. Sinners need mercy, since they have no merit. Perhaps the latter half expresses forgiveness of sin committed; or, it may express the effect of love in preventing the committal. Peter

9 Use hospitality one to another without grudging.
10 As every man hath received the gift, *even so* minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God.
11 If any man speak, *let him speak* as the oracles of God; if any man minister, *let him do it* as of the abil-

9 using hospitality one to another without murmur-
10 ing: according as each hath received a gift, ministering it among yourselves, as good stewards of
11 the manifold grace of God; if any man speaketh, *speaking* as it were oracles of God; if any man ministereth, *ministering* as of the strength which God

learned this precious truth from his Lord. See Matt. 18: 21, 22. He had asked how often he ought to forgive an offending brother, and probably thought he put the number high when he asked, "till seven times"? "Seventy times seven," was the Lord's reply. So Peter, well qualified to say it, tells his readers that love covereth a *multitude* of sins.

9. One of the *manifestations* of the love enjoined in ver. 8. **One to another.** It should be kept in mind that the Epistle is directed to many, and these scattered in different provinces. (1:1.) It follows that opportunities for showing hospitality would not be few. Hospitality is sometimes shown by savages, but is purest and most constant where Christianity exerts its strongest influence, whether in the city or in the country. Compare Rom. 12: 13; Heb. 13: 2; 3 John 5; 1 Tim. 3: 2; 5: 10. See a singular illustration of inhospitableness in Diotrephes. (3 John 9, 10.) Jesus extolled the virtue in Peter's hearing (Matt. 25: 35, 36), but condemned selfish forms of it. (Luke 14: 12-14.) Wisdom is necessary lest hospitality be withheld from the worthy and conferred upon the worthless. **Without grudging.** *To grudge* was formerly to *murmur openly*, but it now means what it was beginning to mean even when the Common Version was made (Trench, *Authorized Version*), *to repine inwardly*. The Revised Version renders, *murmuring*. The Greek seems to be used in one case (John 7: 12, compare 13) to express "whispering, low and suppressed discourse." (Robinson.) If given at all, hospitality should be given with cheerfulness. It is possible to give it with hypocritical cheerfulness, in comparison with which it would be better to imitate certain Samaritan villagers. (Luke 9: 53.) Of the two, he who gives hospitality and murmurs when the guest has gone that he came, and he who refuses to give it to one who needs it, the former would seem the more richly to deserve *the fire*. (Luke 9: 54.) But it is difficult to know his state of mind before commanding the fire to descend; so false are his words and face.

10. Another manifestation of love. **The gift**—*a gift*. In the times of the early Church, miraculous endowments were conferred at baptism, and these were *charismata* (gifts). See Rom. 12: 6-8; 1 Cor. 12: 4, 28. But the apostle may also refer to natural endowments and the usual endowments of grace. Whatever gift any Christian has should be used, not merely or chiefly for his own advantage, but for the good of others. The entire church should have the benefit of it. He should '*minister*' it, should employ it in the service of others; should not deem it beneath him to do so. **Even so** is an unnecessary insertion. **As good stewards**—as is fitting men who do not possess the gifts in their own right. They are but stewards; they hold the gifts in accountability to him who is the Lord of stewards—God. The Christian who has an impressive view of this cardinal fact, and *acts accordingly* in all his church relations, is probably as near perfection as he will ever be in this life. The grace is **manifold**—various, many-colored, because of the variety of the gifts which grace confers.

11. Two kinds of gifts are specified, *speaking* and *ministering*. **If any man speak.** Speaking in the church, to which alone is the reference, was either in the form of prophesying, or teaching, or exhorting. (Rom. 12: 6-8.) **As the oracles of God.** What he speaks he must speak, not as if it were woven out of himself, but as communications from God, drawn either from the Old Covenant or from the New. [Does not λόγια θεοῦ (*oracles of God*) taken in connection with χάρισμα (*gift*, ver. 10) point to *inspired* communications, uttered by one who has the gift of prophecy, rather than to communications taken from inspired sources?—A. H.] **Let him speak as.** The words supplied 'let him speak,' are connected by some with 'minister' in ver. 10, which will be made clear by supplying *ministering*, thus—*as ministering the oracles*. Whatever the gift, he must minister it for the good of others. But it is better to supply, as in the Common Version and the Revision, 'let him *speak*,' or, *speaking*. If any man has the gift of *speaking*, that he must minister. **If any man minister . . . as of the ability,** etc.—that

ity which God giveth; that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ: to whom be praise and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.

12 Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you:

13 But rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that, when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy.

supplieth: that in all things God will be glorified through Jesus Christ, whose is the glory and the dominion [1] for ever and ever. Amen.

12 Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial among you, which cometh upon you to prove you, as though a strange thing happened unto you:

13 but inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings, rejoice; that at the revelation of his glory

14 also ye may rejoice with exceeding joy. If ye are

1 Gr. *unto the ages of the ages.*

is, *as ministering of, out of, the strength*, etc. It is evident that 'minister' is here used in a narrower sense than in ver. 10. This specific ministering consisted probably for the most part of relieving the poor, the sick, and the aged. Whatever service is done must be done in conscious acknowledgment of the fact that it is done, and all the good which may result from it, in strength given from above—an exhortation always needed, so prone is religious activity to forget its divine origin. **That** the end declared; namely—that God, not themselves, may have the honor of the ability and success. **Through Jesus Christ**—since Christ is the Mediator through whom God ministers strength. **To whom**—to God, is on the whole the more probable, since *God* stands as the subject in the preceding clause. (Huther.) **Forever and ever**—one among the many instances in which the words express *unending duration*. **Amen**—as an adjective, *true, faithful;* as an adverb, *truly, verily*. It was sometimes used as a response. (1 Cor. 14: 16.) At the close of doxologies, it means as here, *so be it*. Thus, even before the approaching end of the Epistle (5: 11), the apostle hastens to give utterance to his overflowing spirit of praise in a sublime doxology. **Be praise** (glory) **and dominion**—whose *is the glory and the dominion*. It is not the expression of a wish; it is a declaration. See on 1: 3. The article is never used either in classic or New Testament Greek by chance: it always means something. Here it hints that praise and dominion rightfully belong to God; the glory and the dominion *which are his due*.

12. Third Exhortation, growing out of their relation to persecutors. With the related thoughts it extends to the end of the chapter. **Beloved.** See on 2: 11. **Think it not strange,** etc.—be not surprised at. **The fiery trial**—literally, *burning*, applied figuratively to trial, calamity, here 'fiery trial.'—a "felicitious rendering." Our translators have taken no notice of two words which stand before the Greek for 'fiery trial.' Translating them, we have the fiery trial *among you*. The trial affected, or threatened to affect, them *all;* it was among them viewed as a community. The trial may have been in part the beginning of the persecution by Nero, or it may have been the slanders of those among whom they dwelt. (2: 20; 3: 9, 16; 4: 4.) **Which is to try you.** Putting their Christian character to *the test* for the sake of improving it was the end of the fiery trial. That the human activity employed to test them was itself sinful is no evidence that the end was not designed by the Holy One. He who passes through life without sharp trials is more to be pitied than congratulated. **Happened**—*were befalling you*. Be not surprised, for your trials are the fruit of God's purpose. Good men in all ages have been called to suffer, and blessed will be the results.

13. Rejoice. Rejoice in the fiery trial, which is better than to be surprised at it. They are not merely to "hold still" and let the test work out the intended result, but they are to rejoice. **Inasmuch**—*in proportion as*, or, *in so far as*. It may be arranged thus: *So far as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings, rejoice*. Their enemies would persecute Christ if he were among them, for it is really he who is the object of their hatred; and, therefore, in being persecuted themselves, they are partakers of Christ's sufferings. See Col. 1: 24. But the chief reference must be to the sufferings which Christ himself bore. **Shall be revealed**—should be, *in the revelation*. **Also**—should be brought in earlier than it is either in the Common Version or the Revision, thus: *that also in the revelation*, etc. It puts in contrast the joy which they are to have in the future with the joy which they ought to have now. 'The revelation'; to be made at his second coming, and the glory which will eternally follow. Compare Matt. 25: 31; Col. 3: 4. **Glad,** etc. Though the same strong word in the original is applied (1: 6-8) to their state of mind in

14 If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy *are ye;* for the Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you; on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified.
15 But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or *as* a thief, or *as* an evil doer, or as a busy-body in other men's matters.

reproached [1] for the name of Christ, blessed *are ye;* because the *Spirit* of glory and the Spirit of God
15 resteth upon you. For let none of you suffer as a murderer, or a thief, or an evil-doer, or as a meddler
16 in other men's matters: but if *a man suffer* as a

1 Gr. in.

this life, yet here it seems to be put in contrast with the weaker term, rendered 'rejoice.' They should rejoice now, and doing so, they will rejoice exultingly then. Peter learned long before to do what he here exhorts others to do. He is not a mere theorist. A golden experience makes golden utterances. The possibility of rejoicing in trials has had many signal illustrations in the history of the Lord's people, not only in martyrdom, but in sickness and poverty. The writer once had acquaintance with a Christian woman who was remarkable for spirituality and for sweetness of disposition under long protracted and painful sickness. In one of his calls, he ventured to ask how she thought she could receive the announcement that she was to lie in such suffering *seven years more?* With quiet firmness, and with what no one who knew her could doubt was the result of profound self-knowledge, she replied: "It would make no difference to me—just as my Saviour chooses." Seven years more of suffering were allotted her—confined to the bed fourteen years—but her spirit continued to the last in the same sweet harmony with the will of God.

14. A confirmation of ver. 12, 13, by a distinct reference to the *reproach* (*railing*), as caused by their relation to Christ. **Be reproached**—*are reproached.* **For the name of Christ.** The meaning is made clear by Mark 9: 4 (a cup of water to drink *in my name, because ye belong to Christ*). In our passage the original preposition is the same as in Mark, and instead of *for the name* might stand *in* the name. Peter might have added, as Jesus added, the explanatory words, "because ye belong to Christ." **Happy**—*blessed.* See on the same word, 3: 14. **For** (*because*)—points to the proof that they are blessed. **The Spirit of glory**—the Holy Spirit; and he is called the Spirit of glory as Christ is called the Lord of glory (1 Cor. 2: 8), and God the Father of glory. (Eph. 1: 17.) The glory of the Spirit is seen in his nature and work. Notice the contrast implied in *reproach* and *glory.* To you belongs reproach; to the Spirit, glory. On the other hand, the glory of the Spirit becomes yours, **resteth upon you.** The enemies of Christians are in truth the only ones that have reason to regard themselves as objects of shame. The Christians could have avoided reproach by continuing with the men of the world, but they would not have gained the abiding glory of the Spirit. **And of God.** If we translate *even* instead of 'and,' we make *Spirit of God* explanatory of *Spirit of glory.* "The Spirit of glory and (consequently) the Spirit of God—the Spirit of glory, which is no other than the Spirit of God himself." Meyer, § 20, p. 132. The Revised Version translates with *and.* The reference is both to the Holy Spirit and to God the Father. The remainder of the verse has little manuscript authority, and is rejected by leading critics.

15. But—*for.* Peter introduces the warning with this particle, in order to impress upon his readers the fact that the blessedness can be theirs only on condition that sufferings come upon them as Christians. Should they be guilty of murder, or of theft, or, speaking more generally, of any kind of immorality, and suffer in consequence, that will change the case; no blessedness can be theirs, for the Spirit of glory and of God will not rest upon them. **As.** The supply of this word before **thief** and **evil doer** is unnecessary. It stands before **busybody**—and this for the purpose of giving that word special prominence. 'As,' as being a **murderer.** But what the apostle means by the Greek, represented by 'busybody,' is not quite clear. Only here is the word found in the New Testament, and in Greek classics it is unknown. According to its etymology it means an overseer of other men's matters; the last part of the compound being the very word which is sometimes, though erroneously, rendered *bishop;* and so, figuratively, it may be one who, 'as it were, plays the bishop in another's diocese.' (Cited by Lillie.) *Busybody* or *intermeddler*

16 Yet if *any man suffer* as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf.
17 For the time *is come* that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if *it* first *begin* at us, what shall the end *be* of them that obey not the gospel of God?
18 And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?
19 Wherefore, let them that suffer according to the

Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him
17 glorify God in this name. For the time *is come* for judgment to begin at the house of God: and if *it begin* first at us, what *shall be* the end of them that
18 obey not the gospel of God? And if the righteous is scarcely saved, where shall the ungodly and sin-
19 ner appear? Wherefore let them also that suffer

is probably not far from correct. Paul showed similar anxiety relative to the Christians in Thessalonica. (1 Thess. 4: 11; 2 Thess. 3: 11.) Robinson suggests as probable that Peter intended to warn them against being indiscreet zealots relative to heathen manners and customs. There might have been some danger at that point. Busybodies are even now not wholly unknown. Advancing civilization seems to do little in restraining the fertility of the brood.

16. Peter likes to reiterate the thought that the suffering must be suffering which is borne on account of Christ. **As a Christian.** The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch. See Acts 11: 26; also Acts 26: 28; James 2: 7. 'The origin of the term is left in some uncertainty. It has been thought that the name was invented by the Romans or by the Greeks. It would not have been applied first by the Jews, for they would not have admitted the implication of the term, that Jesus was the Messiah. It is improbable that the Christians themselves assumed it; such an origin would be inconsistent with its infrequent use in the New Testament. The term may not have been at first opprobrious, but distinctive merely.' (Hackett.) **Glorify God.** See ver. 11, and 2: 20; compare 2: 12. **On this behalf.** Another and preferred reading gives, *in this name*—that is, the name of Christian.

17. For. What follows is given as the reason for not being ashamed on account of their sufferings and for glorifying God. **For the time,** etc.—*for it is the time of the beginning of judgment.* Even the Christians must be regarded as under judgment; for their trials, though a ground of joy, yet being needed to free them from sin, are in some respects a judgment. See Matt. 24: 9-13. The fiery trial (ver. 12) *begins* the judgment of believers. Compare Jer. 25: 29; Ezek. 9: 6. "Begin at my sanctuary." But the judgment of Christians will not issue in their destruction. Christians will be saved. (Ver. 18.) **At the house**—*from* the house. The preposition indicates more than the English *at.* It begins *at and goes onward toward others.* (Huther.) **House of God**—the church. 1 Tim. 3: 15; compare 2: 5. Think of Ananias and Sapphira. **If first at us.** The apostle conceives the judgment as beginning from Christians first, because the first act in the drama is the persecution which they suffer. He now brings out the chief thought, which, for the sake of emphatic contrast, is preceded by reference to the judgment of Christians. **The end**—the final issue. **Obey not**—disbelieve, implying opposition. **Gospel of God**—good news proclaimed from God by the Messiah and the apostles. (1 Thess. 2: 9.) It is also called the gospel of Christ. (Rom. 15: 19.) It is called so by Mark (1: 1), who wrote in some sense under the supervision of Peter himself. The apostle purposely uses such comprehensive language that he may include, not only the immoral, but the moral, if rejecting the gospel.

18. A more solemn development of the reason for not being 'ashamed.' It is a quotation of the Greek translation of Prov. 11: 31, which varies from the Hebrew. **The righteous.** It is in the singular number, meaning *the righteous 'man';* he who has become righteous, not necessarily sinless, through faith in Christ. Even such a man is **scarcely,** *with difficulty,* **saved.** The pitfalls of life are many, and his sight has not become perfect. He is saved (Phil. 1: 6), but notice the difficulty as implied in Phil. 2: 12, and see 2 Pet. 1: 10. Compare 2 Pet. 1: 11. An *abundant* entrance is possible, after all. How striking that no answer to the solemn questions is attempted! What the end? Where appear? Some are attempting to answer them by saying that the end will be eternal bliss; they will appear among the holy ones of heaven: if not immediately, yet after an indefinite period of suffering. Peter answers not, which is the most solemn way possible of saying that the 'end' will be eternal death, and the *place where* will be the one prepared for the devil and his angels. (Matt. 25: 41.)

19. Wherefore—in view of all that has been said concerning suffering, especially the

will of God commit the keeping of their souls *to him* in well doing, as unto a faithful Creator.

according to the will of God commit their souls in well-doing unto a faithful Creator.

CHAPTER V.

THE elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of

1 The elders therefore among you I exhort, who am a fellow-elder, and a witness of the sufferings of

blessed results of suffering. "Also" is found in the Bible Union and the Revised Versions, and should have appeared in the Common Version; let them *also* that suffer. **According to the will of God.** Their sufferings must be those of true Christians (ver. 15, 16), for then they can be sure that they suffer according to God's will, and then, *also*, they will be able to commit *their souls* to a faithful Creator. [May not the reference be to martyrdom chiefly or exclusively? See Luke 23: 46; Acts 7: 59.—A. H.] **Commit the keeping of**—*entrust their souls*. Expunge 'the keeping of.' **Souls.** See on the same word 1: 9, and especially as used 3: 20. **As** should not be retained. Read—*entrust their souls to a faithful Creator in well doing*. Thus Peter would impress upon them the fact of the divine faithfulness; God will do all that he has promised to do. Persecution may destroy the body, but it cannot touch the soul. **In well doing.** They must continue to do well, and then there will be no inconsistency between the life and entrusting their souls to God.

This chapter, while precious in practical precepts, and while occasionally re-echoing in subdued notes the praise and exultant joy of the sections preceding, is characterized, as are no other parts of the Epistle, by great solemnity.

CRITICAL NOTE.—CHAPTER IV.

3. The manuscripts differ considerably in the Greek of this verse. Besides the instance already noted, the rejection of (ἡμῖν) *us*, it should be mentioned that (τοῦ βίου) *the life* is wanting in many of the best manuscripts. It is rejected by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort. θέλημα (*will*) is rejected for βούλημα, which, however, is also properly rendered *will*. κατεργάσασθαι (*to have wrought*) has but feeble support, but there is good authority for κατειργάσθαι.

Ch. 5. THIRD SERIES OF EXHORTATIONS (*continued*).

The remainder of the final series divides itself into two parts: the first (1-5) addressed to elders and to younger persons; the second (5-9) to the readers generally.

1. The elders. Another and accepted reading gives, *elders therefore*. *Presbyter* is the Greek in English spelling, and partly upon the original word as used here and elsewhere is based the conviction of some, that the Presbyterian form of church government is the Scriptural form. But in the primitive churches the minister was sometimes called *elder*, and sometimes *bishop*. The explanation is not difficult. The original word for *elder* (Πρεσβύτερος) was of Jewish origin (Ex. 3: 16); the original word for *bishop* (ἐπίσκοπος) was of Greek origin. It was natural, therefore, in writing to Jews to use *elder*, and in writing to others to use *bishop*. Every minister was a bishop, and every minister was an elder. See Acts 20: 17, and compare ver. 28; Titus 1: 5, and compare ver. 7. *Bishop* and *elder*, then, were applied to the same church officer, and no other church officer was known except *deacon*. The office of apostle was temporary. It was of such a nature that it could not be transmitted: it was impossible for an apostle to have a successor. Were a list of qualifications of the bishop and of the elder to be arranged in two columns, one could write either *bishop* or *elder* over either, and neither would be inappropriate. It is not improbable that the elders as a class consisted of men somewhat advanced in age, for the churches were yet to make the discovery that it was not well to put themselves under men of experience. On the contrary, it was necessary to guard the churches against thinking too lightly of young men. 1 Tim. 4: 12: "Let no man despise thy youth." **Among you.** The readers are supposed to belong to different churches (1: 1), and one or more of these elders may have been connected with each church, or possibly some of the smallest churches had no elders at all of their own, but were visited by elders of some large church. **I exhort**—a tender word. **Who am also an elder**—*who am a fellow-elder*. Though an apostle (1: 1; Matt. 10: 2), Peter puts himself in genuine humility upon an equality with elders. Never, by act

Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed:
2 Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight *thereof*, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind;

Christ, who am also a partaker of the glory that
2 shall be revealed: Tend the flock of God which is among you, [1]exercising the oversight, not of constraint, but willingly, [2]according to *the will of* God;
3 nor yet for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither

1 Some ancient authorities omit *exercising the oversight*.....2 Some ancient authorities omit *according to the will of God*.

or word, does he show that he considers himself superior in rank to other preachers, whether elders or apostles. **Witness of the sufferings of Christ**—both eye-witness and preacher. (Acts 5: 32.) He had seen his Master's entire course of suffering. It is difficult to believe that having bitterly repented of his denial, he did not see the crucifixion itself, though in the anguish of his spirit he may have stood afar off. This is the sixth time that he has made distinct mention of his Master's sufferings. What he saw he preached. **And also**—*who am also*, as in the Revised Version. It is an emphatic connection of the two ideas of suffering and glory, and connection of the two is a favorite thing with the apostles. (4: 13; 2: 20; 1: 7; Rom. 8: 18.) **The glory that shall be revealed.** Col. 3: 4; 1 John 3: 2. The glory of Christ which will shine out at his second coming and onward through eternity—shine upon his people, and shine out from them, is meant. Of that glory of Christ the apostle has the most beautiful assurance that he is even now a sharer. Equally strong may be, and ought to be, the conviction of all the elect.

2, 3. Feed. The original is more comprehensive. It includes feeding, watching over, guiding, protecting. *Tend* includes all. How affectionate is this apostolic echo of the Lord's command to Peter himself: *Feed* (*tend*) *my sheep*. (John 21: 16.) The elders must instruct, comfort, reprove, guide, the several churches, and the individual members of which they are composed. **Flock.** See on 2: 25. Once straying like sheep, they need even now the faithful care of divinely appointed shepherds. **Of God.** How penetrating the appeal! Can they neglect the flock which belongs to God? **Among you**—in the different provinces (1: 1) where you live. The elders were among the Christians (ver. 1), and the Christians were among the elders. **Taking the oversight.** The original word is akin to *episcopos* translated in 2: 25 *bishop*, but it would be as great an error to translate it *perform the duties of a bishop* as was committed in using *bishop* in 2: 25. It means substantially what the Common Version says. It is taking the spiritual care of those over whom they are placed, and this is intended by the apostle as an explanation of *tending*. After all, it is doubtful whether the words should appear. The Revisers accept the Greek as the correct reading, and translate *exercising the oversight*, yet say in the margin that some omit the words. The Greek is rejected by Westcott and Hort. The spirit in which the oversight is to be taken is presented with rhetorical fullness in a threefold antithetical form: (*a*) Not by constraint, but willingly; (*b*) Not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; (*c*) Neither as being lords over God's heritage, but as being ensamples to the flock. **Constraint**—*necessity*. They are to perform their duty not under an impulse from without, but under an impulse from within; their service must be rendered *willingly*, *heartily*. He who would gladly escape from the ministry if he could escape without loss of reputation or bread, is but a minister in mask. Paul indeed says (1 Cor. 9: 16), that necessity is laid upon him, but *necessity* is not used in the same sense as here. He was willingly impelled (ver. 17) by consciousness of obligation. It was an inward, not an outward, necessity. **Filthy lucre**—*sordidly* (an adverb in the original); that is, for the purpose of making money. The money made, would, under the circumstances, be filthy lucre. The elders had the right, as the apostles had, to a support from the churches (1 Cor. 9: 7-14), but they were not to make even a support the motive for entering or continuing in the ministry. Constitutional love of gain, habitual "anxiety to save," is a disqualification for the Christian ministry. Compare 1 Tim. 3: 3; 6: 5–10; 2 Tim. 4: 10, and remember Judas Iscariot. It is equally true that a spendthrift cannot be a "good minister" of Christ. Penuriousness and extravagance, though like two oxen, pulling hard apart, yet draw under the same yoke. **Of a ready mind**—*readily* (here, also, in the Greek, an adverb, corresponding to the ad-

3 Neither as being lords over *God's* heritage, but being ensamples to the flock.
4 And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.

as lording it over the charge allotted to you, but
4 making yourselves ensamples to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall be manifested, ye

verb above named, *sordidly*) or, better, *willingly*. It implies *cheerful* alacrity. He who works in the ministry sordidly, will soon find the filthy lucre a clog. **Neither as being lords over God's**—*neither as lording against or over*. "God's" is an insertion by the translators. The participle for *lording* is combined with a preposition, the meaning of which is *down, down upon*. The combined words express *intensity* of action. Lording *down upon* is lording *against;* or as one may say in good English, lording *over*. The preposition causes the verb to express greater arrogance and severity. **Heritage**—*the heritages*. The article points them out as well known; they are the churches over which the elders preside. The Greek originally meant *lot, portion*, what is conferred as inheritance or possession. (Acts 26: 18; Col. 1: 12.) It is the Greek word from which *clergy* (κλῆρος) was derived, and therefore some, hastening to give the word a meaning which it never had in apostolic times, have considered the apostle as requiring the elders not to lord it over the clergy. To apply the word to national churches is an equally great mistake, for a national Christian Church is a body of which Peter "died without the sight." **Being ensamples**—*becoming examples*. Their influence must be that of a pure and gentle life. **Flock.** As this answers to *heritages*, it may be seen that the latter must refer, as above, to churches. As Dean Howson says (*Horæ Petrinæ*), "Nothing could be more simple, more lowly, more affectionate. No contrast in literature is more striking than the difference between the style of St. Peter's own epistles, and that in which his so-called successors have often written. Here is no trace of any consciousness of a divine grant of supreme jurisdiction. If the plenitude of teaching and of ruling were vested in St. Peter and his successors, we should surely find the assertion of it here. But we do not find it here."

This exhortation to elders seems like a warning prophecy of the changes which were to come. The sessions of a Presbyterian Church, consisting of the pastor and ruling elders, is a judicatory for the exercise of government and discipline.[1] It has power to receive members and power to exclude.[2] These elders hold office through life. The power of the people has been lost, however, chiefly through the rise of Episcopacy. Within one hundred years after the apostles, the original oneness of bishop and elder began to disappear; *bishop* came to be applied to a small class of ministers, while other ministers continued to be called *elders;* the bishops grew in ambition, dared to call themselves the successors of the apostles, arrogated the exclusive right to ordain, and claimed that the Holy Ghost would not be given through any other fingers than their own. Diocesan power became metropolitan power, metropolitan power became patriarchal power, and patriarchal power became papal power. Bishops deposed bishops. Councils came into vogue, and, becoming the tools of the higher clergy, had the arrogance to demand of the churches the acceptance of creeds hammered out upon their own anvils. It is not surprising that in view of the quarrels and lust of bishops an ancient idolater said: "Make me a bishop, and I will surely become a Christian."

Ecclesiastical monarchy still prevails. In the papal form of development it has brought upon itself the strongest condemnation by that quintessence of all arrogance—infallibility. Millions of human souls are ground into the dust by being denied that right "of private judgment in matters of religion in opposition to authority," which, as the Roman Catholic Archbishop Spalding says,[3] "is the fatal source of all this mischief"—"American infidelity and indifference."

4. This verse states the certainty of the blessed result which will accrue to the elders, if they shall obey the exhortation just given. The reward will be conferred at the appearing of the chief Shepherd, Christ himself, called in 2: 25 *the Shepherd;* in Heb. 13: 20 *the great Shepherd*, and by himself (John 10: 14) *the good Shepherd*. **Chief.** The elders, then, are shepherds in the service of Christ. But Christ is the Shepherd of all the flock—that is, all the

[1] "The Form of Government." Book 1, Chap. 5. [2] *Id.*, Book 1, Chap. 9: 7. [3] "Miscellanea," p. 383.

5 Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder. Yea, all *of you* be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility: for God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble.

shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not
5 away. [1] Likewise, ye younger, be subject unto the elder. Yea, all of you gird yourselves with humility, to serve one another: for God resisteth the

1 Or, *Likewise . . . elder; yea, all of you one to another. Gird yourselves with humility.*

elect. **Shall appear**—*shall be manifested.* It refers to the second coming, viewed by Peter in his consciousness as near, though, perhaps, not viewed as near in time. See on 4: 7, and see Col. 3: 4; 1 John 2: 28. **A crown**—*the crown;* no other like it. *Ye shall receive the amaranthine crown of glory*, is the literal rendering. In 1: 4 occurs *fadeth not*, the original of which is akin to the Greek used here. Whether the apostle has in his eye the beautiful conception of a never-fading flower (amaranth) "is very doubtful" (Lillie), but Huther otherwise. 'Crown.' Probably Peter has in mind a wreath of flowers; nor is it improbable that he thinks of those in the Grecian games on whose heads such a wreath was placed in token of victory. Still, as we are reminded, such flower-wreaths were used among the Jews. **Glory**—the bliss of heaven, the chief element of which will be the life of God poured into the soul through Christ. This figurative method of representing the rewards of the future is one which the New Testament writers freely use. See 1 Cor. 9: 25, *an incorruptible crown;* 2 Tim. 4: 8, *a crown of righteousness;* James 1: 12, *the crown of life.* What activity and what powers of endurance under trial should ministers of the gospel manifest!

5. Likewise. Compare the use of this word in 3: 1, 7. It implies that, as the writer had an exhortation for the elders, he now has one 'likewise,' *also*, for the younger. **Younger**—in age, not in office, in support of which latter view has been adduced the case of the young men who buried Ananias and Sapphira. (Acts 5: 6, 10.) But who are the *elders?* The elders of ver. 1?—that is, elders in office? But why should Peter select only the younger in age as needing an exhortation to submit to elders in office? It is replied that the younger would be more inclined to have their own way. Probably; but it would be strange if the other members, the middle-aged, were wholly superior to the necessity of similar exhortation. It is quite in accordance with the practice of the New Testament writers to use the same word twice in different senses, even though the words may stand near each other. 'Elder' may therefore be understood as *elder in age.* That would include all the other members, whether in or out of office. It is, then, an exhortation to those who are younger in age to submit to those who are older in age. Peter's knowledge of human nature should be noticed. The exhortation is needed now. Deference toward the older members of a church by the younger is a virtue which has never been known to grow too rank. A few passages may aid in the cultivation of so beautiful a trait of Christian character. See 1 Kings 12: 6–8; Prov. 16: 31; 20: 29; Job 32: 7; Lev. 19: 32.

Yea, all. The apostle here speaks more generally. What he requires of the younger in their relation to the elder, he requires of *all* in relation to *all*—a marvel of practical theology. The rich must submit themselves to the poor, not less than the poor to the rich; the learned to the ignorant, as well as the ignorant to the learned; and even the elder to the younger, equally with the younger to the elder. See Luke 22: 24-26. "Contradictory and absurd" the world cries; but he who is "clothed with humility" sees the reasonableness and harmony of it all. **Clothed.** The original, found nowhere else in the New Testament, is a peculiar word; not the word which the Greeks commonly used to express the simple idea of being clothed. Some think the word was derived from the name of a slave's frock, and infer its peculiar appropriateness to express *humility.* This is too artificial. Others give it a meaning almost the opposite—*ornament yourselves.* The word is more probably derived from one which expresses that by means of which a garment is fastened, and so, according to some, it enjoins the duty of being *girded* with humility. The question is one pertaining only to the *shade* of meaning which the word may have as a figurative one. The general meaning is clear enough, and is expressed by Bengel thus—"*Put on and wrap yourselves in*, so that the covering of humility cannot possibly be stripped from you." **With humility.** The

6 Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time:
7 Casting all your care upon him; for he careth for you.
8 Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour:

6 proud, but giveth grace to the humble. Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God,
7 that he may exalt you in due time; casting all your
8 anxiety upon him, because he careth for you. Be sober, be watchful: your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may

duty is also enjoined in Eph. 4: 2; Phil. 2: 3; Rom. 12: 16. Often had Peter learned the lesson from his Master. (Matt. 18 1-4; Mark 10: 15; John 13: 14-17.) As so often before, the exhortation is supported by a citation from the Old Testament—that is, from the Septuagint translation of Prov. 3: 34. Compare Luke 1: 51, 52. The passage is cited also by James. (Jas. 4: 6.)

6. Therefore—because to the humble grace is given. **Under the mighty hand of God.** This is the more forcible, because enjoined upon all without respect to position. It refers to the endurance of sufferings, which is evident from ver. 7. They must bear with humility the sufferings which God, as with a mighty hand, lays upon them. See Deut. 3: 24. Exaltation to spiritual honor is most desirable, and that they must consider as the end. **In due time**—whenever God shall see fit to do so. It may occur partly in this life, but it will certainly occur in the next life. The worlds were made *by* the mighty hand of God, and are held *in* his mighty hand; but in suffering the Christian is *under* his mighty hand.

7. All your care—*anxious* care. The original word is akin to that found in Matt. 6: 25, "Take *no thought*"; *thought*, when the Common Version was made, having strictly the meaning of *anxiety*, or *solicitous care.* (Trench.) They were to throw off upon God all their burden of anxiety. **For he careth for you.** The Greek does not have such related words as appear in the English, *care*, *careth*, but for rhetorical emphasis it brings into proximity the two pronouns rendered respectively *him* and *he*, thus—Casting all your care upon *him*, for to *him* belongs care for you. Compare the beautiful exhortation in Ps. 55: 22, "Cast thy burden upon the Lord and he shall sustain thee," with which, evidently, Peter was familiar. No sweeter thought has yet been uttered in the ear of these suffering Christians.

8. The requirement to throw off upon God their burden of solicitude implies no grant of carnal security. **Be sober**—twice before. (1: 13; 4: 7.) See on the former. **Be vigilant**—*watch.* Notice the rapid energy of the style. He hastens from the former to the latter without stopping to use a connecting particle; and if the critics must be followed, or rather as the best manuscripts ought to be followed, **because** must be expunged, and this makes the swiftness and energy of the thought still greater. With characteristic power, and flashing as if in heated remembrance of his own narrow escape (Luke 22: 31, 32), he says—*Be sober! watch! the devil seeks you!* **Your adversary.** An antagonist in law was called an 'adversary' (*antidikos*), and the term was applied in a general sense to any one who put himself in hostility to another. The Scriptures everywhere recognize, Christ himself recognized, the existence of a being, who, though once in possession of a will in harmony with God's, is now hostile to the Creator, especially in his work of saving men through Christ; and this is the being to whom the apostle refers. **The devil.** It points out the antagonist by a well-known name. *Satan* is of Hebrew origin. (Job 1: 6.) *Diabolus* (devil) of Greek origin. The attempt to disprove the personality of such a being has been a failure. Satan would have been better pleased had the people been led to believe the attempt successful. **As a roaring lion,** etc. See Gen. 49: 9, where Judah is called a lion's whelp. Christ is called a Lion (Rev. 5: 5), but, as Augustine says, cited by Huther, "*Christus leo propter fortitudinem, diabolus propter feritatem; ille leo ad vincendum, iste leo ad nocendum.* (Christ is a lion on account of his courage, the devil on account of his ferocity; the former is a lion to conquer, the latter to injure.) 'Roaring,' which is frequently referred to in the Old Testament as a terrible characteristic of the lion, adds power to the description. Smiling, however, is as easy for the devil as roaring—an adept at both, and whichever doing, is bent on evil. **Walketh about**—*is walking*; his custom. He was walking *very near* where Peter himself was at the time of his fearful sin. He is continually in

9 Whom resist steadfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world.
10 But the God of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered a while, make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle *you*.

9 devour: whom withstand stedfast in [1]your faith, knowing that the same sufferings are [2]accomplished
10 in your [3]brethren who are in the world. And the God of all grace, who called you unto his eternal glory in Christ, after that ye have suffered a little while, shall himself [4]perfect, stablish, strengthen

1 Or, *the*.....2 Gr. *being accomplished*.....3 Gr. *brotherhood*.....4 Or, *restore*.

motion. He is above the necessity of taking rest, which is not contradictory to Matt. 12: 43 ("When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest"); for these words do not indicate ceasing from the pursuit of victims, but they show the opposite—the restlessness of a demon when cast out of a man. **Seeking whom**—or, possibly, *some one*. **He may devour**—or *swallow down*. The figure expresses ruin, and implies ruin of body and soul. Satan desired to have Peter himself. (Luke 22: 31.)

9. As in ver. 8 the apostle guards them against the indolence which might result from casting their care upon God, so now he guards them against the danger of trusting in the activity enjoined. They must **resist,** but they must resist **steadfast,** *firm*, **in the faith.** No resistance of the devil will be successful which is made in their own strength—still another clear echo of Peter's experience. Christ once prayed that *his* faith might not fail. Here, too, the case of Ananias and Sapphira is solemnly instructive. It was this very apostle, who, after bitter experience of the sinfulness of yielding to Satan, and after the deepest sorrow for doing so, faithfully reproved those corrupt members of the Church in Jerusalem. "Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?" Fearful illustrations of the consequences of not resisting the evil one! (James 4: 7.) When seeking whom he may devour he walks, when resisted he flees: the spirit is the same. Peter sees him walking about; James sees him fleeing. **Knowing.** Their knowledge of the fact will lead them to cultivate the habit of *considering* it. **The same afflictions** which they are suffering **are accomplished** (continuance of action) upon their **brethren,** their *brotherhood*, literally. See 2: 17. Considering the fact of the sufferings of their brotherhood in the world will be one means of strengthening their faith, and of qualifying them to resist. What suffering believers have been able to do and to bear, may be seen in Paul and his companions (2 Cor. 4: 8-10; 6: 9, 10), and even in many of the Old Covenant time. For the latter, see Heb. 11. Peter and James (4: 7), as well as Peter and Paul, are in harmony. The brotherhood of Christians, viewed as a general fact, is a precious one: brotherhood in suffering will be followed by brotherhood in eternal glory. *The third series of exhortations is ended.*

10, 11. A promise and a doxology. The Common Version gives the expression of a wish rather than a promise, but the tense of the Greek now generally adopted is the future: *will* make you perfect, *will* establish, etc. *All grace.* *All* the grace which is shown toward men is God's grace; or it may refer to *variety* in the gifts which result from grace. **Grace.** See on the same word in 1: 2. **Hath called**—should be, *called.* They were called at a given time in the past—that is, when they were regenerated, as in 2: 9. Compare 2: 21. **Unto his eternal glory.** Notice that it is *his* (God's) glory to which they were called; therefore the meaning is, that they were *to share* God's glory. The same rich thought is expressed by Paul in 1 Thess. 2: 12; 2 Thess. 2: 14. They share it here, but the fullness of the gift is reserved for the future. **By Jesus Christ**—*in* Jesus *Christ.* It expresses not instrumentality, but communion with Christ's life—a favorite idea. Westcott and Hort with some others consider 'Jesus' as not supported by sufficient manuscript authority. **After that ye have suffered a while** (*a little time*). *The perfecting*, etc., is indeed carried on *while* they are suffering, which thought has been elsewhere expressed, but the apostle conceives the grand result as occurring *after* the sufferings. But another explanation is more usually given; that which connects the suffering with being called unto his glory, thus: *who called us unto his eternal glory, after we have suffered.* Suffering precedes glory. **Make you perfect.** The Common Version takes no notice of an emphatic pronoun; *himself* will make you

11 To him *be* glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.
12 By Silvanus, a faithful brother unto you, as I suppose, I have written briefly, exhorting, and testifying that this is the true grace of God wherein ye stand.
13 The *church that is* at Babylon, elected together with *you*, saluteth you; and *so doth* Marcus my son.

11 [1]you. To him *be* the dominion [2]for ever and ever. Amen.
12 By Silvanus, [3]our faithful brother, as I account *him*, I have written unto you briefly, exhorting, and testifying that this is the true grace of God.
13 stand ye fast therein. [4]She that is in Babylon, elect together with *you*, saluteth you; and *so doth*

1 Many ancient authorities add *settle*.....2 Gr. *unto the ages of the ages*..... 3 Gr. *the*.....4 That is, The church, or the sister.

perfect. It excludes all others. 'Perfect,' *will fully furnish*—that is, such as one should be, deficient in no part. (Robinson.) See Heb. 13: 21. **Stablish**—will make firm. (2 Thess. 2: 17; 3: 3.) It is the same word in the Greek as is found in Luke 22: 32: "Strengthen thy brethren." How his Lord's command must have imprinted itself upon the apostle's heart! So the exhortation given to Peter is by Peter transformed into one of the richest of promises. **Settle you**—*will ground* you upon an immovable foundation. The original word is used in Matt. 7: 25, "founded" upon a rock, and in Eph. 3: 17, "grounded," in love. Here, also, Peter flashes onward in quick, sudden strokes, without connecting particles. The Greek for 'settle' is omitted by Westcott and Hort. As to the doxology, see on 4: 11.

12. Silvanus—the same, probably, as is mentioned in Acts by the name of *Silas*. The Epistles always use the form found here. It was not unusual for Jews to have two names. Saul was also called Paul. *Silas* was probably the Jewish and *Silvanus* the foreign name; yet it need not be supposed that he was never called Silas except in Palestine or by Jews. Silvanus stood high among early Christian laborers. He is classed with Paul, Barnabas, and Judas Barsabas, as a *leading* man among the brethren. (Acts 15: 22.) He was appointed to one of the most important services of apostolic times. (Acts 15: 1-31.) He was a public teacher. (Acts 15: 32.) He was Paul's companion on his second missionary tour. He was imprisoned with Paul at Philippi, where, with the apostle, he poured forth thanksgiving to God in songs constructed probably from poetic portions of the Old Testament. (Acts 16: 19-40.) How long he continued to labor with Paul, or what special object brought him into this brief connection with Peter, is unknown. Peter writes the Epistle by him—that is, he sends by him the Epistle which he himself wrote. **Have written**—*wrote*. The Epistle is nearly completed, and the apostle conceives it as finished. See Crit. Notes. **A faithful brother**—*the* faithful brother; a pleasant testimonial. Upon the "sharp" disagreement of Paul and Barnabas concerning Mark, Silas was preferred by Paul as a co-worker instead of Mark, who was chosen by Barnabas. (Acts 15: 37-40.) As Mark was closely allied with Peter (for example, in the preparation of the gospel which bears his name), it would not have been strange had Peter's special relation with Mark led him to show a touch of unsanctified human nature toward Silas; but *Silas is the faithful brother*. Some connect 'unto you' with *write*, and some (the Common Version) with *faithful*. It is not easy to decide which the apostle intended. But See Crit. Note. **As I suppose.** Too weak, or if this translation is retained it must not be considered as showing doubt. The apostle says he *thinks*, he *considers*, he *accounts* (Revised Version) the brother as faithful; and this is a judgment formed upon what he knows of his Christian character. **Briefly.** He could have written more, for his heart is full of desire for their comfort and growth under sufferings. **Exhorting and testifying.** See Introduction, II. **This is the true grace**—not the grace of which he has been writing, but that which they received at their renewal. 'Grace'—divine favor, implying always that those to whom it is shown do not merit it. 'True'—having reality, a veritable existence. It is not intended as a contrast with error of doctrine. (Huther.) It has been supposed that the apostle here refers to Paul, and intends to say that Paul's preaching, which they are supposed to have heard, was true; but there is nothing to justify that view. **Wherein ye stand.** Some manuscripts give another form of the verb, which several critics accept: *in which stand.*

13. The church that is . . . you. The English reader will notice that these words are in italics. For these the Greek has no corresponding words. The Sinaitic manu-

14 Greet ye one another with a kiss of charity. Peace *be* with you all that are in Christ Jesus. Amen.

14 Mark my son. Salute one another with a kiss of love.
Peace be unto you all that are in Christ.

script, which is at least one of the oldest, has the Greek word for 'church' after Babylon, but the manuscripts in general have no noun whatever. Literal rendering: *The co-elect in Babylon saluteth you.* The two principal views are: 1. That Peter's wife is meant (1 Cor. 9: 5); 2. A Christian church. The former view seems unentitled to acceptance, since it is difficult to see how it could be necessary to add *in Babylon.* It would seem to be enough to say, *the co-elect saluteth you.* But it would have been very natural to add the name of the place, if a church were meant. Notice the correspondence between *co-elect* here and *elect* in 1: 2. The consideration by itself, however, is by no means decisive. **Babylon.** Most Roman Catholic expositors insist that *Rome* is meant. But if Rome is meant, 'Babylon' is used figuratively; yet in this very simple, unimaginative close of the Epistle, such a figurative (symbolic) form of expression would have been contrary to the way in which the human mind usually works. Not Babylon in Egypt can be meant, for that was scarcely more than a military post. Babylon in Chaldea was still sufficiently large to be a place of some importance, and it is known to have been a place of residence for Jews. It is true that according to Josephus, many of the Jews had been driven away, but there is no reason to suppose that there were none remaining. That is probably the Babylon to which Peter refers. It is singular that Roman Catholics should incline to apply to Rome the name of *such* a city as Babylon, but it is intended to help a theory which greatly needs all possible support. **Marcus**—son of a Mary who lived in Jerusalem (Acts 12: 12), and into whose house Peter went after his release from prison; *John* Mark (Acts 12: 12; 15: 37); *John* (Acts 13: 5, 13); *Mark.* (Acts 15: 39.) *John* was his Jewish, and *Mark* his Roman name. Mark was a cousin to Barnabas (Col. 4: 10), which may have influenced the latter's choice. (Acts 15: 37.) His reluctance to accompany Paul on one of the apostle's missionary journeys was a fault (Acts 13: 13), but Paul's magnanimous reference to him (2 Tim. 4: 11) is worthy of special note. He was with Paul in Rome when the latter was a prisoner. (Col. 4: 10; Philemon 24.) He was doubtless the writer of the gospel which bears his name. **My son**—spiritually; probably converted by Peter's means.

14. Greet—*salute.* **A kiss of charity**—*of love.* A *holy* kiss. (Rom. 16: 16; 1 Cor. 16: 20; 2 Cor. 13: 12; 1 Thess. 5: 26.) This sign was not to be given them as from Peter, but Peter exhorts that they give it to **one another,** and, as Meyer suggests on 1 Cor. 16: 20, they probably gave it immediately after reading the Epistle. This was not merely a form of salutation; it was a method of expressing their *Christian love,* and "was, specifically, a recognition or ratification of one another's Christian character. The kiss, as a token of love or friendship or respect, was as common in Oriental countries as shaking hands is in Europe and the United States. Esau kissed his father (Gen. 27: 27); Laban his sister's son (Gen. 29: 13); the woman who was a sinner kissed the Saviour, applying the token to the feet as expressive of her humility; Simon violated custom in *not* kissing Jesus (Luke 7: 45, 'Thou gavest me no kiss')." The Epistle concludes with the expression of desire that **peace** may be with them. **All that are in Christ Jesus**—all that are in communion with him, all who have become sharers in his spiritual life. 'Jesus' and **Amen** have little sanction from manuscripts.

CRITICAL NOTE.—CHAPTER V.

The objection to connecting ὑμῖν (*you*) with ἔγραψα (*wrote*) is that the former is brought in so early, standing between Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ (*by Silvanus*) and τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ (*the faithful brother*). Translated in the order of the Greek: *By Silvanus to you the faithful brother, as I suppose, briefly I wrote.* But the objection seems greatly weakened, if not wholly removed, by comparing the arrangement with a similar one in Gal. 6: 11: Ἴδετε πηλίκοις ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα (*ye see how large to you a letter I wrote*). Here it is evident that ὑμιν (*you*) must be connected with ἔγραψα (*wrote*). Such, therefore, may be the connection in the verse before us.

INTRODUCTION TO THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER.

I. WAS PETER THE WRITER?

It would be an error to affirm that the Epistle to the Hebrews, if not written by Paul, was forged, for it does not profess to have been written by him. But the Epistle which goes under the name of "The Second Epistle of Peter" must have been forged if not written by Peter. The question before us is therefore one of great importance. As is the case with all the other epistles, the sources of evidence are either external or internal.

I. External. This is not very strong. The Epistle has been accepted since A. D. 363 as belonging to the Canon of Scripture. The decision to receive it was made by the Council of Laodicea. But this is not evidence that Peter wrote it. Quotations from the Epistle in the earliest Christian writings would afford strong evidence in its favor, but it is affirmed that no quotations can be found. "The Epistle is not quoted," says Farrar, "and is not *certainly* referred to by a single writer in the first or second century. Neither Polycarp, nor Ignatius, nor Barnabas, nor Clement of Rome, nor Justin Martyr, nor Theophilus of Antioch, nor Irenæus, nor Tertullian, nor Cyprian can be proved to allude to it. . . . During the first two centuries the only traces of it, if traces they can be called, are to be found in the Pastor of Hermas, and in a recently discovered passage of Melito of Sardis; but even these are of so distant and general a nature that it is impossible to determine whether we should regard them as reminiscences of the language of the Epistle, or accidental approximations to it." ("Early Days of Christianity.") On the other hand, in works of most of the above-named writers, several of whom, because following first after the apostles are called Apostolic Fathers, Dietlein thinks he has discovered many allusions. Not a few, however, besides Farrar, think that Dietlein is entirely mistaken.

A serious difficulty ("entirely new and very formidable," "Early Christianity") arises from resemblance to the writings of Josephus. In "The Expositor" for 1882, an English periodical, the authorship of our Epistle is discussed in three articles by Rev. Edwin A. Abbott, D. D. In the first article is considered the question, "Had the author read Josephus?" in the second, "Had the author read St. Jude?" in the third, "Was the author St. Peter?" The nature of the question at issue in the first article is expressed by Dr. Abbott as follows: "If it could be shown that the author had borrowed from some work of which the date is known to be late—*e. g.*, the "Antiquities" of Josephus, published in A. D. 93, the date of the Epistle would then be determined to be after 93 A. D., and the author of the Epistle would be known to be not St. Peter." Dr. Abbott attempts to prove that the author of the Epistle had read the "Antiquities" of Josephus. If his attempt has been successful, it is certain that the Epistle was not written by Peter, for Peter died many years before Josephus wrote his "Antiquities." That the author of our Epistle imitated Josephus, not Josephus the author of the Epistle, appears clear to Dr. Abbott for the following reasons: "It exhibits, 1. A very large number of similar words

and phrases in the two authors; 2. All the phrases and words on which stress has been laid above are words and phrases rare or non-existent in the New Testament and LXX, and therefore completely out of the author's natural sphere; 3. The groups of similarities between the Epistle and the 'Antiquities' are found in just those portions of the latter which our author would be likely to have studied; 4. Besides parallelism of thought in the two passages selected above to exhibit the parallelism of language, we find two others in which our author agrees with Josephus in diverging from, or at all events adding to, the Bible narrative." These considerations, which are given at the close of Dr. Abbott's article, are illustrated by previous citations from the two writers. An examination of Dr. Abbott's "Discovery" would be out of place in the present work, but the writer may take the liberty of saying that it is by no means certain that the author of our Epistle borrowed from Josephus. The arguments against that view are so weighty that the people of God need not feel called upon to consider the Epistle as the work of some other than the Apostle Peter. He feels constrained to add that Dr. Abbott's third article,[1] "Was the author St. Peter?" is so extravagant in its representation of the *style* of the Epistle as to amount to a caricature. It were possible so to translate almost any paragraph of the Bible as to justify the application of "vulgar pomposity" and "verbose pedantry" to the original. "He leadeth me beside the gentle liquidities" (Ps. 23 : 2), is scarcely an adequate illustration of the unfairness and absurdity of many of Dr. Abbott's renderings of the Epistle of Peter. We give one instance, and to those who desire to pursue the subject farther, we suggest the reading of Farrar's article in "The Expositor" of the same year, in which he makes an examination of Dr. Abbott's third article. The Common Version (2 : 22) is—*The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and, the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.* Dr. Abbott translates (?), "The dog having returned to his own evacuation, and the sow having bathed to her wallowance." A more *judicial* treatment of the entire question is desirable. The spirit of the mere advocate is not favorable to ascertaining truth.

Such are some of the difficulties drawn from external sources. As in the case of one or two other books of the New Testament, this Epistle was longer in coming into general acceptance. To this fact there is a favorable side, for it shows that Christians of early times were not disposed to receive in haste every book which might profess to be inspired. It may be added that the Epistle is received by a large number of modern scholars even in Germany, though in part, perhaps chiefly, on internal grounds. Even Farrar, though deeming the difficulty arising from the similarities between the Epistle and Josephus as "very formidable," does not reject it.

But something of a more favorable kind concerning even external evidence remains to be said. 1. In the works which have come from one of the greatest of the Fathers, Augustine, bishop from A. D. 395, is "a list of the books of the New Testament exactly agreeing with our present Canon." (Westcott, "On the Canon of the New Testament.") 2. Jerome, A. D. 390, has a Catalogue in which occurs the Second Epistle of Peter, and the doubts which some had relative to the authenticity of the Epistle were not shared by that well-informed Father. 3. Receding from this date toward the apostolic age, we find a Catalogue of all our present books in the works of Gregory Nazianzen, A. D. 328–389. 4. Eusebius, A. D. 270–340, was one of the celebrated Christian men of early times. He

[1] [In Prof Salmon's "Introduction to the Books of the New Testament" the reader will find a satisfactory answer to the argument of Dr. Abbott against the genuineness of the Second Epistle of Peter.—A. H.]

was a voluminous writer, a historian, and it is through him that we obtain knowledge of the opinions of many who lived before him. From his works it is clear that he was acquainted with the Second Epistle of Peter, and that, because it appeared useful to many, it was generally read. Yet it must be admitted that while he did not reject it as spurious, Eusebius was not prepared to admit it to an equal footing with the books which are now received. 5. Origen, in Eusebius. This Father was born in Alexandria, Egypt, A. D. 185, and died at Tyre, A. D. 254. In the Greek text of his writings are no quotations from Second Peter, but in the Latin translation by Rufinus are many—*e. g.*, 1 : 4. "Peter," he says, "has left behind one Epistle generally acknowledged; perhaps also a second, for it is a disputed question." In the Latin Homily on Joshua 7 is the following: "Peter, moreover, sounds loudly on the twofold trumpet of his Epistles." It is clear that Origen did not reject our Epistle as spurious; he only held its genuineness as not entirely settled. Too much dependence, however, must not be placed on the Latin translation. 6. Firmilian, A. D. 256, Bishop of Cesarea, in Cappadocia, speaks in a letter to Cyprian of Paul and Peter as condemning heretics in the epistles; but as First Peter makes no allusion to heretics, it may be inferred that he alludes to Second Peter. 7. Clement of Alexandria, A. D. 165–220, gave, according to Eusebius, "explanations of all the Canonical Scriptures without omitting the disputed books." (Westcott.) One of the disputed books was Second Peter. By some this testimony is thought to be slightly weakened by a remark of Cassiodorus, but by others not at all. 8. Tertullian, born in the last of the second century, and Cyprian, converted to Christianity A. D. 246, make no allusion to it. 9. Justin Martyr, A. D. 138, and Irenæus, who died about A. D. 202, are believed by some to make unmistakable allusions to our Epistle; but by others, as seen above, the references are not deemed certain.

II. INTERNAL. As already remarked, the Epistle is Peter's, or it is a forgery. That it is not a forgery may be safely concluded from the following considerations: 1. *Its general tone.* Though some of its views are peculiar, yet the entire Epistle is in harmony with other Epistles known, on abundant historical evidence, to be authentic. In this respect the writer has made no slip by which one might be led to suspect forgery. But it is also positively spiritual, devout, and trustful. It contains nothing puerile, nothing feeble, which is far more than can be said of most of the writings which immediately followed the apostolic age. It has been confidently affirmed that not one of the Apostolic Fathers could have produced a writing evincing such intellectual ability and such elevated spirituality. It must, therefore, have been written before their time—*i. e*, in the apostolic age itself. 2. *The writer is confident that he shall soon die.* Yet it is *possible* that one might deliberately allow one's self to forge even in the face of approaching death; for many a man has died with a lie on his lips, but in such cases that particular sin has been in accordance with the entire life. It is morally impossible that an Epistle which is throughout unexceptionable in morality and piety, should have been written by one whose approach to death was marked by one of the boldest falsehoods ever told. 3. The writer professes to have been with Christ at the Transfiguration, which was one of the falsehoods told, if he was not with him. But the difficulty of supposing it to be a falsehood is expressed above. 4. In ver. 1 the writer distinctly avows himself to be Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, and the objection to calling this a falsehood is also to be seen above. The supposition that the Epistle is a forgery is too nearly absurd to allow its acceptance. Then it was written by Peter. Some writers have laid much stress upon the fact that the Epistle is, in style and spirit, very unlike the First; but,

though the differences in these respects are indeed striking, they are not more so than is to be seen in the writings of many an author, even when the writings were composed with no longer interval of time than is supposed to have existed between these two Epistles. This objection, without others of more weight, may well be offset by the striking resemblances.

II. PLAN AND OBJECT.

The Epistle consists of two parts, and each part of two sections. In section first (1 : 1–11) of part first, after the address, the readers are reminded of the gifts conferred upon them by divine power; are exhorted to bring forth certain specified virtues, and to be earnest in securing the salvation to which God has elected them; they are assured that on that condition they shall not fail of entering into the kingdom of Christ. In section second (12–21), the writer gives the reason which prompted him to write, and assures the readers that what he has taught relative to the Second Coming of Christ is true. In section first (2 : 1–22) of part second are described certain false teachers, libertinists, licentious men, and their overthrow and punishment are foretold. In section second (3 : 1–10), the writer describes the scoffers who deny the Second Coming of Christ, and accuses them of willful ignorance relative to the origin and the destruction of the world, and assures the readers that the coming of the Lord will certainly occur. He closes with an exhortation based upon these facts, alludes to Paul and his Epistles, and again exhorts to steadfastness.

III. IS THE EPISTLE IN PART A COPY OF JUDE'S EPISTLE?

A comparison of the two Epistles shows some remarkable resemblances. Compare 1 : 5 with Jude 3; 2 : 1 with Jude 4; 2 : 4 with Jude 6; 2 : 6–10 with Jude 7; 2 : 10 with Jude 8; 2 : 11 with Jude 9; 2 : 12 with Jude 10. The resemblance of these passages is so striking, that many have affirmed intentional copying, though with some changes; as condensation, expansion, more simplicity or less. Resemblances granted, the question is: Which Epistle was written first? As in the past, so, doubtless, in the future, there will be no oneness upon the point. The view that Peter wrote first seems on the whole to be the more probable. The resemblances and the differences constitute an interesting literary question; but they have little significance as related to the authenticity of either epistle, and none as related to our spiritual life. See on the same subject, III., Introduction to the Epistle of Jude.

IV. WHEN WRITTEN, AND WHERE?

There are no means of deciding. Possibly it was written from Rome; for, as there can be no doubt that Peter suffered martyrdom there, he probably went to Rome after he wrote the First.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER.

CHAPTER I.

SIMON Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like precious

1 [1]Simon Peter, a [2]servant and apostle of Jesus Christ to them that have obtained [3]a like precious

1 Many ancient authorities read *Symeon*.....2 Gr. *bondservant*.....3 Gr. *an equally precious*.

Ch. 1: 1, 2. INTRODUCTION. The Introduction gives the inscription, the character of the persons addressed, and the salutation. **Simon**—*Symeon*, or *Simeon*. Simon is the Greek form, and Symeon the Hebrew form. Even the Hebrew name had some variations. See Gen. 29: 33 (Simeon); 1 Chron. 4: 20 (Shimon.) Simeon is used in Acts 13: 1 by the historian, and in Acts 15: 14 by James in his speech before the assembly in Jerusalem. Simon is the form generally used. It is uncertain which is here the true reading, Simon or Symeon. The name was not uncommon among Romans and was very common among Jews. It means *hearing*. The application of the name to a child implied, at least sometimes, that God *had heard*. (Gen. 29: 33.) The man who, in the temple, took up the infant Jesus in his arms, and, blessing God, uttered the singularly rich prophecy concerning the object of the child's advent, bore the name Simeon. (Luke 2: 25.) The New Testament mentions, also, among others, Simon the "Canaanite,"[1] one of the twelve apostles, Simon of Cyrene, Simon the leper, Simon Magus, Simon the tanner, Simon the father of Judas Iscariot. **Peter.** See on 1 Pet. 1: 1. Simon, *who is called* Peter, is found in Matt. 10: 2. It has been suggested that the apostle here uses both names in conscious reference to his earlier state, and that into which he is supposed to have come afterward. The suggestion is not without a basis of possibility, but the probability of such a reference is slender. For some account of the apostle's life, and for a brief characterization, see "I. Introduction to the First Epistle." **A servant and an apostle.** In the First Epistle the official designation is briefer, "an apostle." In Jude, also, it is briefer, but there it is "servant." Paul sometimes designated himself in the longer form (Rom. 1: 1; Titus 1: 1), and sometimes in the shorter. (1 Cor. 1: 1; 2 Cor. 1: 1; Gal. 1: 1, etc.) Neither James nor Jude says "apostle"; each says "servant." Here "servant" (*bondservant*) is not used merely in the sense in which it may be applied to Christians in general; it is doubtless an official use of the term, indicating that the writer regards himself as a servant in ministeral labor, while "apostle" is the narrower term, expressing not only the form of ministerial labor peculiar to the twelve, but also the authority peculiar to them. Farrar ("Early Days of Christianity") translates "slave," which is scarcely a just representation of the Greek. See upon this question the last part of the notes on 1 Peter 2: 18. Peter's acknowledgment of himself as a servant of Christ, was an acknowledgment that Christ had the right to direct him in all his ministerial life; and it was precisely that right in which the apostle gloried. Like Peter, ministers of all times should wait for Christ's "orders," not for man's, and when the orders come should obey with promptness and alacrity. "An apostle"; one *sent away*, and while the word was applied in this general sense to the twelve, it had the special meaning implied in their peculiar official position in distinction from that of all other ministers. Peter has been called the first pope; he never calls himself pope. See further on 1 Pet. 1: 1, and also on 5: 1, on the nature of the apostleship. **Jesus Christ**—as in 1 Pet. 1: 1. Paul usually said the same, though in most cases, according to the approved reading,[2] he put "Christ" first, which fact has special significance. "Jesus" is the Greek form, while *Joshua* is the Hebrew form. Joshua is a shorter form of Jehoshua (*help of Jehovah, Saviour*). The Greek form is used for Joshua in Heb. 4: 8. ("For if

[1] The wrong spelling. The apostle here meant was not a Canaanite, for as Dr. Schaff reminds us ("Companion to Greek Testament and English Version"), "None of the apostles belonged to the race of Canaanites." Simon the Cananean is correct. See Matt. 10: 4. Revised Version.

[2] Concerning different readings of Greek manuscripts, see remarks on 1 Pet. 1: 8.

faith with us through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ:
2 Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord,

faith with us in the righteousness of [1] our God and 2 *the* Saviour Jesus Christ: Grace to you and peace be multiplied in the knowledge of God and of Jesus

1 Or, *our God and Saviour.*

Jesus had given them rest.") "Jesus" was a common Jewish name, but was given to the first born son of the virgin Mary for the special reason that he was to save his people from their sins. (Matt. 1: 21.) "Christ," anointed. It is used by the New Testament writers to designate the Being who was believed by the Jews of Old Testament times as appointed *to come* (Matt. 11: 3), God's ANOINTED. It is equivalent to Messiah. "We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ." (John 1: 41.) **To them that have obtained,** etc. This is one of the cases, so common in the Greek, of a short method of expression. Given fully: *to them that have obtained faith equally precious with that which we have obtained.* "Them" and "us" must not be referred to Gentiles and Jews; the former refers to all who are described, whether Jews or Gentiles, and the latter to Peter himself, or to the apostles as a class. **Faith**—not Christianity as external, but that faith which Christianity inspires. Peter writes, not merely to the Christians of Asia Minor, as in his First Epistle, but to all Christians then living; and indeed, according to the intention of the Holy Spirit, to all the saints of all the ages that were to follow. Comprehensive benevolence in a forger! As to the word "General" in the title of the Authorized Version, see on the same word in the title of the First Epistle, first paragraph of the notes. **Precious.** See 1 Pet. 1: 18, 19 (precious *blood.*) Here we have **through the righteousness,** etc. Precious also is this faith as the foundation of Christian character, as investing the present life with something of the power of the future life, and as giving the possessor ability to appropriate the future life as one of unending bliss. **Like**—as precious in kind as that of Peter and the other apostles. Whether it is equally *strong* in all Christians is a question not touched. **Have obtained**—literally, *obtained by lot.* See Luke 1: 9; John 19: 24. The faith was "obtained"; it came from a source external to themselves. In no sense did they originate it; personal merit, then, is not to be thought of. **The righteousness,** etc.—not, as Frommüller, "an attribute of God," not "the personal righteousness of believers" viewed as God's because given by him, but the entire scheme of the gospel as an exhibition of divine righteousness and mercy. Here is the germ of the doctrine so much enforced by Paul in Romans. (1: 17; 3: 21, 22, 25; 4: 13 and elsewhere.) See also Galatians, and Crit. Notes.

"Through," either *in* or *by means of.* The Greek preposition means primarily *in*, but in the New Testament often expresses *instrumentality.* The righteousness is the medium or source of faith. **Of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ**—of *our* God, etc. The question is, whether "God and Saviour" are both to be connected with "Jesus Christ"—that is, whether Jesus Christ is here called God as well as Saviour; or whether two distinct persons are meant, God the Father and Jesus Christ. In ver. 2 an evident distinction is made: *of God, and of Jesus our Lord.* See ver. 11, "our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," where the arrangement of the Greek is the same as here, but, which is a very important difference, *Lord* (κύριος) is used instead of *God* (θεός). See also 2: 20, "of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ"; 3: 18, "of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." In Titus 2: 13, "of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." Nowhere, unless here, does Peter apply directly to Jesus Christ the word *God*, which is a strong, perhaps decisive, consideration that he does not so apply it here. See Crit. Notes.

2. Grace . . . unto you. See on 1 Peter 1: 2. **Though (*in*) the knowledge.** Peter makes free use of this word knowledge (1: 5, 6 8; 2: 20; 3: 18), but never in the sense in which it was used by the false philosophy which soon attempted to force its way into the churches. The kindred verb was used by Christ in his memorable prayer. (John 17: 3.) Knowledge of God, in Scriptural use, is not mere speculative knowledge: it pertains to the heart quite as much as to the intellect; it implies knowledge of Jesus our Lord. A very few who, in consequence of having no written

3 According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that *pertain* unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue:

3 our Lord; seeing that his divine power hath granted unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness through the knowledge of him that called us
4 [1]by his own glory and virtue; whereby he hath

1 Some ancient authorities read *through glory and virtue.*

revelation, were ignorant of Christ, may have attained, nevertheless, to some knowledge of God, but such knowledge of God as it is possible for men to attain, is impossible if Christ is not known. Professing to know God, and at the same time rejecting Christ, is proof of great and culpable ignorance — ignorance which comes more from disease of the heart than from weakness of the head. Peter uses two words, both of which are represented in the English by *knowledge* (ἐπίγνωσις and γνῶσις). The former occurs in ver. 2, 3, 8; 2: 20; the latter in ver. 5, 6; 3: 18. The context of these verses makes it very improbable that the writer used the words in different senses, though the former may in itself include the idea of *acknowledging* in addition to the idea of *knowledge*, which is the exclusive meaning of the latter. It may sometimes be used in a stronger sense, *full* knowledge. *Knowledge* (γνῶσις) is a term which was much used in Alexandria and elsewhere. *Gnosticism* (the word is akin to that used by Peter) was one of the most dangerous errors of ancient times. It was a foolish kind of wisdom. Possibly Peter had the germ of the error in his eye. The "agnosticism" of the present is remarkable for being neither foolish nor wise, since it *knows nothing at all.*

PART I. SECTION FIRST.

Ch. 1: 3-11. The superscription and salutation being ended, the Epistle proper begins. This section divides itself thus: 1. What has been done for them; 2. What they themselves ought to do. The latter is hortatory; the former is the doctrinal foundation. The method is this: As God has done given things for them for a given end, they are earnestly to strive for given Christian traits. The second verse is closed by some with a period, and by some with a colon. The connection of ver. 3 with that verse is not so close as a comma indicates.

3. According as—*inasmuch as.* The sense is, *persuaded*, or *knowing that.* In the original, **all things** is made emphatic by being put next after the conjunction: Inasmuch as *all things have been given.* It is difficult to see what Peter could have intended in the *all things*, unless it were the promises. (Ver. 4.) These, through application to the heart by the Holy Spirit, would promote both life and godliness. **That pertain**—and therefore subserve. **Life**—spiritual life, the result of being begotten by the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. (1 Pet. 1: 3.) It implies blessedness, but that is not the principal thing meant. The difference between their former state of death and their present state of life is more than can be told. When men lose their prejudice against "theology," and speak as educators, as men of business, as employers or employed, they have no difficulty in feeling that men are depraved, which is what the Scriptures mean by being *dead.* Consciousness of depravity, however, is not generally as marked as consciousness of life. Reason: Depravity ever tends to diminish self knowledge, while life ever tends to increase it. Hence, one may come to have little of that unhappiness which is the natural fruit of sin; while another cannot but be conscious of the blessedness which is the fruit of life. **Godliness**—a righteous state of heart toward God, but manifesting itself in holy activity. *This* is *imparted* righteousness. As to the distinction between imparted and imputed righteousness, see note on ver. 1. **Of him**—of *God*, as in 1 Pet. 1: 15; 2: 9. The call came indeed "through" the Holy Spirit, on the ground of Christ's mediatorial work, but it *came from* God. The New Testament writers never become weary of referring the change which had been wrought upon the souls of their readers to the call of God. They give no prominence to the activity of man in conversion, except as the result of divine, effectual calling. **To glory and virtue.** Revised Version: *by his own glory and virtue.* (Westcott and Hort: διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς, *through glory and virtue;* but they put in the margin, ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ, *by his own glory and virtue.*) Which is the true reading is uncertain. By "glory" may be meant his glorious nature, and by "virtue" his "superiority revealed in

4 Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises; that by these ye might be partakers

granted unto us his precious and exceeding great promises; that through these ye may become par-

the work of salvation." "See Acts 2: 11 (the wonderful works of God)."—*Cremer.* The glory and virtue were *the means by which* they were called—means, because they were used in effecting their regeneration. It is impossible to conceive how the apostle could have more strongly represented God as the source of all which the readers have above what they had by nature. But he has yet more to say (ver. 4) as preparatory to the exhortation of ver. 5–11.

'*Virtue*' (Ἀρετή) is a word of much historical interest, the New Testament use being very unlike that which prevailed in Greek literature. Intense worldliness and Pagan viciousness are to be seen in its derivation. It is traceable to *Arēs* (Ἄρης), Mars, son of Jupiter, and Juno, god of war. Hence, it was applied to war itself. Some trace it to the word signifying *man* (ἀνήρ), and it is certain that manliness or bravery in war was the principal idea which it expressed. The Latin equivalent, *virtus*, was used by the Romans in the same way. As Trench says ("Study of Words"): "It is as if for them all virtues were included in warlike courage alone." As the same writer also reminds us, the Italians of to-day "degrade the word *virtuoso*, or *the virtuous*, to signify one accomplished in painting, music, and sculpture, such things as are the ornamental fringe of a nation's life, but can never be made, without loss of all manliness of character, its main texture and woof, not to say that excellence in these fine arts has been in too many cases divorced from all true virtue and worth." Christianity took the word 'virtue' (ἀρετή) out from the ignoble uses to which it had been consecrated, and made it the watchword of Godlike excellence. The application of the word to God is very unusual, and has led to severe stricture of the Epistle (as not Peter's) by Dr. Edwin A. Abbott. See the "Introduction, I., Was Peter the Writer?" But the same word in the plural is applied to God in the First Epistle 2: 9 ("shew forth the praises—*virtues*—of him"), and not, as Farrar ("Early Days") says it is, "in a very different sense." The sense seems to be essentially the same here as there.

4. Whereby—*by which*—that is, by which glory and power. **Are given**—*he hath given* (*granted* as a gift); **him that called us** (ver. 3)—still referring the readers to the divine source of all. **Exceeding great**—literally, *the greatest and precious*, according to the *Textus Receptus*. But the manuscripts differ. Wescott and Hort, interchanging the adjectives say, *precious and exceeding great*. So the Revised Version. Promises which are so great cannot be of little value. The promises of God to the elect are resolvable into two classes: the one pertains to the coming of a Saviour; the other, to the coming of the Holy Spirit. The latter is the complement of the former. It would not have been in accordance with the boundless sweep of the divine benevolence to give the one and withhold the other. Neither class alone would have had any practical preciousness; but conjoined, the two classes of promises are of infinite value: for they have as their object the glory of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, in making men partakers of the divine nature. For the first promise of the first class, see Gen. 3: 15. See in many of the Psalms, in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Joel, Micah, etc., promises of each class so great and precious as to have awakened the intensest interest of prophets and angels. (1 Pet. 1: 10-12.) **Us**—both Peter and those to whom he is writing. **That**—the end for which the promises were given; for **these** refers to *promises*, not, as some say, to *glory* and *virtue*. The contents of the promises, applied to their hearts, had already made them so far like God that they are justly called God's children. In so far as they are the children of God, they have already become partakers of the divine nature. But the change is not complete. The effect of the promises will not be fully realized till the next life. **Might be**—*may become*. Partaking of the divine nature implies no loss of their own individuality, no absorption of their personality in the personality of God. They partake of God's nature while retaining their own nature. They lose their own nature viewed as depravity, but viewed as organic and constitutional their nature cannot be absorbed into the nature of God. In regeneration God's spiritual life, not his essence, is communicated to the soul. In that sense they

of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust.
5 And besides this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue, knowledge;

takers of [1]the divine nature, having escaped from
5 the corruption that is in the world by lust. Yea, and for this very cause adding on your part all diligence, in your faith supply virtue; and in *your*
6 virtue knowledge; and in *your* knowledge [2]temper-

1 Or, a.....2 Or, *self-control.*

become sharers of God's nature, and only in that sense can they be said to have a new nature. See Heb. 12: 10 ("partakers of his holiness"); 1 John 3: 2 ("shall be like him"); and compare John 1: 12, 13; 1 Pet. 1: 23. *May become* implies growth, but might be expresses (which the apostle does not mean to express) a sudden, instantaneous, and completed participation. **Having escaped**—a strong representation, having escaped *from.* It hints their activity, but makes prominent the result of God's interposition—a wonderful deliverance, since that from which they were delivered was so terrible. **The corruption.** It describes the moral filth of the world without Christianity. (2: 12, 19.) Paul uses the same word in Rom. 8: 21 ("bondage of corruption"), contrasting it with the glorious liberty of the children of God, and in Gal. 6: 8 ("shall of the flesh reap corruption"). The fearful immorality which, with few exceptions, characterized the social life of Greece and Rome, the highest state as well as the lowest, and which has equally marked non-Christian society in all lands and all times, fully justifies the apostolic application of the term 'corruption.' The vileness of man left traces of itself in durable form on the walls of dwellings and in bronze castings, the detail of which would be indecorous to relate; and in proportion as society, after being purified by Christianity, has withdrawn from the purifying influence, it has relapsed into similar pollution. *The world's corruption, which is founded in lust,* expresses the meaning.

5-7. What God has done for them should lead them to the manifestation of appropriate Christian traits. The contrast, on the one hand, between divine power, life, and godliness, knowledge of God, divine calling, glory and virtue, precious and exceeding great promises, sharing the divine nature; and, on the other hand, the corruption, which, originating in lust, pervades the world, is a strong ground of appeal. **And besides this**—*but for this very reason also.* The connection is with 'according as' in ver. 3, thus: *Inasmuch as,* or, as explained above, *knowing that,* all things have been given to us by his divine power, etc.—*for this very reason* manifest the Christian virtues which I am about to enumerate. If Paul was the first Christian logician of the apostolic time, certainly Peter was the second. Paul reasoned more, but Peter, when he reasoned, reasoned as divinely as Paul. In ver. 3 and 4 we have premises which are laid in God's power, glory, and promise, and here in ver. 5–7 are practical conclusions, under the popular form of exhortation, which flow from the premises with conclusiveness, not inferior to that which marks any section of Paul's great Epistle to the Romans. **Giving all diligence**—*exhibiting* on your part earnestness. The apostle has told them in ver. 3, 4 what God has given them, and now he tells them what they ought to do. **Add.** From this word the pulpit has drawn material for its rhetoric, but the idea of arithmetical addition is not Peter's. *Furnish* or *minister,* or *supply* (Revised Version), probably expresses the sense. See ver. 11, where for "shall be ministered" (*shall be supplied,* Revised Version) is the same Greek word; 2 Cor. 9: 10, *ministereth* (*supplieth,* Revised Version); Gal. 3: 5, *ministereth* (*supplieth,* Revised Version). The preposition *in* (ἐν) is not, strange to say, translated at all in the Common Version, for *to* was not intended as a rendering of the Greek preposition. But *in* is the only translation which the word here admits. Thus the apostle says, *in your faith minister* (or *supply*) *virtue.* You have faith; see that it be such as to include virtue, leading to it and embracing it. By *virtue* may be meant something more specific than moral excellence, as fortitude, energy, vigor (in the Christian life, and therefore a Christian virtue). Cremer gives it the more general meaning. **And to** (*in*) **virtue** (*supply*) **knowledge.** For the meaning of 'knowledge,' as used in ver. 2, 3, see on ver. 2. While not excluding the ideas there expressed, it may here be used more distinctly of the *practical understand*

6 And to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness;
7 And to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity.
8 For if these things be in you, and abound, they make *you that ye shall* neither *be* barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

6 ance; and in *your* [1]temperance [2]patience; and in
7 *your* [2]patience godliness; and in *your* godliness
[3]brotherly kindness; and in *your* [3]brotherly kind-
8 ness love. For if these things are yours and abound, they make you to be not idle nor unfruitful

1 Or, *self-control*.....2 Or, *steadfastness*.....3 Gr. *love of the brethren*.

ing which is so necessary to the successful accomplishment of the ends of their new life. They must not be satisfied with virtue. In it should be supplied knowledge. Without knowledge their virtue might be erratic. **And to** (*in*) **knowledge** (*supply*) **temperance.** You have knowledge; let it be such as to include temperance. By 'temperance' is meant self-control in all respects, though with special reference to the passions. See Acts 24: 25; Gal. 5: 23. **And to** (*in*) **temperance** (*supply*) **patience**—patience under trials, whether of cares or of persecutions—a virtue often enjoined in the First Epistle. **And to** (*in*) **patience** (*supply*) **godliness**—*i. e.*, right disposition toward God.

7. And to (*in*) **godliness** (*supply*) **brotherly kindness.** Let your godliness be such as to lead to and so include brotherly kindness. The Greek is the same as in 1 Pet. 1: 22 ("love of the brethren"); 3: 8 ("love as brethren"). Right disposition toward God (godliness) implies love toward Christian brethren, though it is equally true that love, Christian love, toward the disciples of Christ implies right disposition toward God. See 1 John 4: 20; 2: 9; 3: 11, 14, 17; 4: 11. **And to** (*in*) **brotherly kindness** (*supply*) **charity** (*love*). The latter is the more comprehensive, all mankind being its object. (1 Thess. 3: 12; Gal. 6: 10.) One of the few infelicitous renderings by the Revised Version is this final clause of the series: *in your love of the brethren love.* Twice they use the same English word *love* where the Greek uses different words: *brotherly love* or *kindness* (φιλαδελφία) and *love* (ἀγάπην). To the Greek reader of the Epistle, there could have been nothing so "intolerable" as the Revised Version gives us. The American Committee would have preferred *brotherly kindness*, and in some American editions this rendering is substitued. The sense of this clause may be expressed like that of the others: as you have love for the brethren, let it be such as to lead to *universal* love. If it is such as it ought to be, it will produce love for all mankind. It should be noticed, then, that these virtues are organically related. The relation is somewhat of a *causal* nature—that is, *faith* may cause *virtue*, and *virtue* may cause *knowledge*—not, strictly, *originating*, but causing a more abundant fruitage of what had already been originated.

8. For points to *the reason why* they should minister in their faith such virtues: they will attain to *much knowledge of Christ.* So the Spirit leads back the apostle to the very position which he took in ver. 2. There he wishes them knowledge; here he assures them that having the virtues they will have the knowledge. Such knowledge as Peter means is heart knowledge quite as much as head knowledge, and therefore the knowledge and the virtues may not always be easily distinguished. Which precedes, it is difficult to say. God's working is not limited to a given order. Know God and his Son Jesus Christ, and Christian graces will thrive; cultivate Christian graces, and knowledge of God will increase. **These things**—the virtues of ver. 5–7. **Be in you**—*are* (really) *yours.* **Abound**—an expressive word in the Greek—literally, *to do*, or, *be more* (than enough). Not dwarfs, but amply developed and ever developing must all these virtues be, if the result mentioned in the latter part of the verse is to be attained. **If** does not imply doubt. No word for 'if' is used in the original. These things *being in you and abounding* is the literal rendering. **Barren**—*idle* or *slothful.* **They make.** According to Lillie the idea is, *render*, constitute, you, establish your character as, *not idle*, not unfruitful in (*as to*) the true knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. A better view is that which, making *in* (εἰς) equivalent to *into*, represents the knowledge as *the aim* toward an ever greater measure of which they are continually to advance. They render you neither slothful nor unfruitful *into* the knowledge—that is, in *advancing* in the knowledge of. Yet, as hinted above, this does not imply that in no degree is practicing

9 But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins.

9 unto the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. For he that lacketh these things is blind, [1]seeing only what is near, having forgotten the cleansing from

1 Or, *closing his eyes.*

the Christian virtues preceded by the knowledge of Christ. Notice that it is not, as in ver. 2, knowledge of *God and of Jesus our Lord.* Knowledge of Christ, then, is knowledge of God. In this verse are traces of the Lord's teaching: 'idle' in the market place (Matt. 20: 3); he becometh 'unfruitful' (Matt. 13: 22). There may have been no *conscious* reference to the Lord's use of the words, yet the words are like reflected touches of light, which the artist's pencil has left upon the canvas. See a remarkably condensed expression of the same sentiment made by the Lord to his disciples on the mountain: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." (Matt. 5: 8.) The *pure in heart* is expanded by the apostle, not consciously, perhaps, into the numerous virtues of ver. 5–7, and 'see God' is represented in 'the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

9. But should be *for.* The positive (ver. 8) is offset by the negative view, and is thereby confirmed—not an uncommon rhetorical way of enforcing a truth. What is called the rhetorical way may be the natural way. The apostle perhaps knew little of rhetoric; but illumined, controlled, inspired, by the Spirit of God, he wrote according to nature. **These things** corresponds with *these things* in ver. 8, and therefore to the virtues specified in ver. 5–7. **That lacketh**—in striking contrast with him 'who abounds.' These virtues no man has till he has been born again, but most men have the opposite sins. **Is blind.** Applied originally to the eyes, it was applied figuratively and with great significance to the mind; and while the intellect of man is blind, it is chiefly the heart (the affections) in which blindness is seated. The blindness is alienation from spiritual things, which does indeed produce stupidity of understanding; but the latter is more the effect of the former than the cause. See Matt. 15: 14; Luke 4: 18; Rom. 2: 19; Rev. 3: 17. **Cannot see afar off**—not a waste of words, but explanatory of 'blind.' He is so far blind that he cannot see afar off (*seeing only what is near*, Revised Version); he is near-sighted. The Greek word is compounded of two, which mean *to close* or *blink the eyes*, which is a peculiarity of many near-sighted persons when, without artificial help, they desire to see a distant object. Those who lack the virtues in question are near-sighted, inasmuch as they cannot see things which are eternal and invisible. (2 Cor. 4: 18.) God is invisible (Col. 1: 15; 1 Tim. 1: 17); his attributes are invisible (Rom. 1: 20); but according to Heb. 11: 27, *the unseen can be seen.* Though lacking Christian virtues, yet one may have sharp sight relative to things which are near—of this world. **And hath forgotten.** When the heart has lost interest in the invisible, memory is brittle relative to things spiritual. It will fail to do its office respecting even the work which has been done, or is believed to have been done, on the very mind of which memory is itself one of the faculties; as, for example, the work of being cleansed from former sins. **That he was purged**—more literally, *having forgotten the cleansing.* The Greek for 'cleansing' is the same as is used in Heb. 1: 3 ("When he had *purged*, *cleansed*, our sins"). It was used of Jewish ceremonial washings (John 2: 6), and of the purification of lepers. (Luke 5: 14.) But in what sense is he here said to be cleansed from his sins? It should be remarked as preliminary that the case is a supposed one rather than one directly and positively affirmed, though this does not appear from the Common Version or from the Revision. The sense is this: For he to whom these *may be* wanting—he who, *by supposition*, is lacking these things. It may, therefore, refer to a regenerated soul, without necessarily teaching, in contradiction to other Scriptures, an actual and continued fall. Like many other passages, it may be of the nature of a warning against apostasy. (Heb. 2: 1-3; 4: 1; 6: 1-9; 10: 26-29.) If it refer to a regenerated person, he was cleansed from his sins in the sense of being delivered from their dominion, which deliverance was effected through the atoning death of Christ received by faith. It may not be justifiable, however, to ground so important a view upon a very delicate peculiarity of the Greek tongue. In that case it must be assumed, in harmony

10 Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things ye shall never fall:
11 For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

10 his old sins. Wherefore, brethren, give the more diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never stumble:
11 for thus shall be richly supplied unto you the entrance into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

with numerous passages which teach that no regenerated person will suffer a final, fatal fall; that being unregenerated, he belongs to that class of which there are not a few in every age, who are greatly enlightened and deeply affected by spiritual things, and at length identify themselves with the people of God by baptism, and show during a short period much interest in whatever concerns the kingdom of Christ, but, having no root in themselves, wither away. (Matt. 13: 6.) Such a man *forgets* that he was, as he thought and as he appeared to others, cleansed from his old sins, such, perhaps, as are described in 1 Pet. 4: 3.

10. The arrangement of the Greek is very emphatic: *Wherefore the rather, brethren, be in earnest, sure your calling and election to make, for these things doing, not by any means shall ye fall ever.* Every word drives the nail further, and the last clinches it beyond the possibility of being drawn. **Wherefore**—in view of the assurance (ver. 8), and the warning. (Ver 9.) **The rather**—all the more in view of the assurance and the warning. **Brethren**—never used in the First Epistle, and used only here in this. He addresses in the same way those who killed the Prince of Life (Acts 3: 17); but only as descendants with himself from the founder of the nation, Abraham. The readers are his brethren as born, like himself, from above. It is even more significant than *dearly beloved* in 1 Pet. 2: 11. He and they have one Father. **The rather** (*the more*) **give diligence**—*give the more diligence*—i. e., be the more earnest. **Calling.** See on *elect.* (1 Pet. 1: 2.) 'Calling' stands before **election**—not because they were first called, and then, having accepted the call, were elected; but because he is just now giving special prominence to what has been done for them in this life, not to what God did from eternity. But can *they* do anything toward making their calling and election sure? What can be surer than God's eternal purpose and God's call? But how are *they to feel sure* that they were elected and called? Ananias and Sapphira must have felt quite confident at the time of their baptism that the question of their salvation had been settled in the counsels of God; and it had been settled, but not in the way they supposed. Dishonesty and lying spoke terribly against the supposition that they had been elected; for those who are elected are elected to holiness, not less than to heaven. The readers are to make their calling and election sure *by doing these things*—that is, by having (abounding in) the Christian virtues. So a holy life will prove to *themselves* that they were elected and called. Peter strikes hard blows at Antinomianism. **Shall never fall**—shall *not by any means ever stumble*, and so lose salvation. Peter has not forgotten his Master's doctrine. They shall never perish. (John 10: 28.)

11. This verse gives the blessed result; and this, as an expansion of the thought 'Ye shall never fall,' enforces the duty of *doing these things: (for so).* **Ministered.** The Greek for 'ministered' is the same as in ver. 3 (*add to*). **Abundantly**—*richly;* a word which, though applied to earthly things, is beautifully applied also to things spiritual. **Entrance.** Strictly, 'ministered richly' qualifies 'entrance'; yet the idea pertains to what is to come after the entrance—eternal bliss. Compare 1 Pet. 4: 18 (the righteous *scarcely* saved), and see notes, first paragraph. That one should be satisfied with the prospect of being barely able to pass through the heavenly gate, speaks poorly for his view of the "wideness of God's mercy." The gate is strait and the way is narrow which *leadeth unto life;* but the gate *at the other end* is broad to him who has been neither slothful nor unfruitful in the knowledge of Christ. **Kingdom**—a word often used by our Lord, but rare in the writings of our apostle. It expresses substantially the same as 'inheritance' (1 Pet. 1: 4); but that views heaven as related to the believer, this as related to Christ. Heaven is conceived as a kingdom over which Christ reigns, yet as embraced within certain limits; whence the expression, 'entrance into.' The conception of a kingdom into which the subjects of Christ are to enter after death is not contradictory to

12 Wherefore I will not be negligent to put you always in remembrance of these things, though ye know *them*, and be established in the present truth.
13 Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting *you* in remembrance;
14 Knowing that shortly I must put off *this* my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me.
15 Moreover I will endeavour that ye may be able

12 Wherefore I shall be ready always to put you in remembrance of these things, though ye know them, and are established in the truth which is with *you*.
13 And I think it right, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance;
14 knowing that the putting off of my tabernacle cometh swiftly, even as our Lord Jesus Christ
15 signified unto me. Yea, I will give diligence that

the idea of a kingdom in this world. (Matt. 3: 2.) The kingdom has been already set up, and Christ is even now reigning; but as it is not here in its completed form, it is represented as it is in the verse before us. See Matt. 8: 11. The conception of a kingdom consisting of persons regenerated by the Holy Spirit is expressed in Jer. 23: 5; Dan. 2: 44, and many other places. Christ's kingdom may be viewed as external, as internal, as beginning, as advancing, as completed. God the Father is represented as King, and as having a kingdom: "Our Father who art in heaven. Thy *kingdom* come." But the kingdom is generally viewed as reigned over by Christ. Christ reigns over it as God's Vicegerent. In this mediatorial capacity, Christ must reign till he has put all enemies under his feet (1 Cor. 15: 25), and when that glorious end shall have come, he will relinquish his mediatorial character, delivering up the kingdom to God, even the Father; but the kingdom itself will continue forever. It is impossible that that should come to an end, unless those who constitute it shall all either become disloyal, or be annihilated. **Everlasting**—*eternal;* used also in Matt. 25: 46; and, what is very striking, the Greek word is there applied to future punishment as well as to future bliss.

12-21. SECTION SECOND. The reason which prompted the apostle to write, and the truth of what he has taught, relative to the second coming of Christ.

12. Wherefore—in view of all I have said, but especially in view of the grand final result. (Ver. 11.) **Will not be negligent.** Another and approved Greek reading gives the meaning, *I will, I intend*, and may be rendered freely, *I will be ready*. **These things**—the things concerning which he has been writing. Peter, so forgetful of some things in the early part of his Christian life, is deeply impressed with the importance of reminding the readers concerning all these gracious things. **Though ye know.** Memory is frail even respecting things which we know; the more worldly the more forgetful. **Present truth**—truth of the present gospel; truth now preached by apostles, and now believed by the readers.

13. Yea—rather, *but—but* though ye know them. **Meet**—*proper* or *fit*. **This tabernacle**—*this tent*, the human body. (2 Cor. 5: 1.) Like a soldier's or a traveler's tent, the body is only for temporary use, is frail, and is easily taken down. As a tent is for human beings to dwell in, so the body is the earthly dwelling place of the immortal spirit. Hence it would be improper to apply the figure to animals. **As long as.** The apostle has no thought of "retiring." **Stir you up**—not that they were asleep, as he himself once slept in Gethsemane, but that he purposes not to allow them to sleep. Literally, 'to stir you up' **in remembrance.** As long as he shall continue to live, he will continue to put them in mind, so that his exhortations may be remembered.

14. He is the more strongly impelled to this by the fact that the opportunity to do so will soon be closed. **Knowing that shortly**—more exactly, *swiftly*, as in the Revised Version. He knows that his death is to be *sudden*. How many of the apostles left the world by means of sickness is unknown. Peter expects to die by martyrdom, as his Lord (John 21: 18, 19) **shewed** him (not *hath* shewed him), *indicated* to him. Some say he learned it by revelation made at a later time—possible, not probable. The verb is in just the tense which Peter would have used had he meant the time referred to in John. The apostle has no reluctance to call to mind the fact of his departure from this world, and the fact that he must suffer death at the hands of the wicked. He is indeed to meet him whom he once denied, but long ago he received assurance of his Master's readiness to recognize him as his penitent disciple whenever the hour of his martyrdom should come.

> For when thy deadly need is bitterest,
> Thou shalt not be denied, as I am here—
> My voice, to God and angels, shall attest,—
> Because I know this man, let him be clear.

15. Moreover—*but also*. The 'also' points to the time after he shall have gone. They

after my decease to have these things always in remembrance.
16 For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty.

at every time ye may be able after my [1]decease
16 to call these things to remembrance. For we did not follow cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and [2]coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we were eyewitnesses of

1 Or, *departure*.....2 Gr. *presence*.

must remember the things, not only before, but 'also' after, he dies. But how are they to be aided in remembering them? By this very Epistle. Some think he refers to the Gospel of Mark. That is possible, but it would meet the requirement of the case if he should be supposed to refer only to the present Epistle. **After my decease**—literally, *after my exodus*, departure, journey out of; that is, out of this world. This word (ἔξοδος) in the sense of *death* is rare, and it is an interesting fact that the death of the apostle's Master, which formed the subject of conversation on the Mount of Transfiguration,, is expressed by the same word: "Who appeared in glory and spake of his *decease*" (*his exodus*). Does Peter make this uncommon use of the word because he remembers it as used then? It *may* not have been used in the conversation itself, but as Luke uses it in his narrative (9: 31) it is probable that it had been used in the conversation. In ver. 11 is the opposite word (εἴσοδος, *a journey into*, "entrance"). To *go out of* such a world as this without *going into* such a world as heaven is inconceivably deplorable. **Always.** A periodical remembrance will not suffice. Alternation of remembering and forgetting is condemned. Romanism has sharp sight. It is able to see here the doctrine of the saint's intercession in heaven on behalf of saints on the earth. Peter is instructing Christians that he will intercede for them after his decease! A logical inference would be that all Christians on the earth may pray to Peter in heaven to pray to God for them. See "Path to Paradise; or Catholic Christians' Manual," pp. 141–145, Dublin, 1846, in which is a long list of persons from that of "Holy Mary" to "St. Bridget" and all the "holy virgins and widows," for whose prayers Roman Catholics are taught to pray, and in the list are the names of the apostles headed by that of Peter.

16. For. The writer now proceeds to strengthen the position which he has taken. In his teaching he gave prominence to the power and coming of Christ, and he purposes to show that that teaching was truth: 1. By what he knew had occurred on the Mount of Transfiguration; 2. By ancient prophecy. This shown, he will have justified the preceding exhortation. **Have not followed**—*did not follow*. **Fables**—*myths*, and these were **devised** (invented and wrought) **cunningly** (with great skill). A myth is a story with little or no historical basis. The myth has been defended as adapted to do the people good, but instead of healing the fever of sin it inflamed it. The Jews had their myths, as well as the Greeks and the Romans. Scarcely any people have been without a large stock of fabulous stories, and nearly all of them have been supremely silly.

> Let all the heathen writers join
> To form one perfect book;
> Great God, if once compared with thine,
> How mean their writings look!

Fables like Æsop's belong to a different class. They are simple, beautiful, and instructive. In his preface to "Antiquities of the Jews," Josephus says: "For as to other legislators" (contrasting them with Moses), "they followed fables; and by their discourses transferred the most reproachful of human vices unto the gods, and so afforded wicked men plausible excuses for their crimes." Elsewhere he speaks of Moses as having "preserved his writings from those indecent fables which others have framed." To what myths Peter referred is of no importance. **When we**—the apostles in general, and in particular John and James, those being the two who, with himself, were in the holy mount. (Ver. 18.) They made known by preaching, and perhaps by their writings. It is possible that Peter includes his own First Epistle. **The power and coming of,** etc. 'Coming' (3: 4; Matt. 24: 3, 27; 1 Cor. 15: 23; 1 Thess. 2: 19) at the last day to judge the world; 'the power' displayed at that time. They are viewed as prefigured in the events of the Transfiguration, and only so is his argument pertinent. **Were eye-witnesses.** The Eleusinia were a celebrated religious festival of the

17 For he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.
18 And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount.

17 his majesty. For he [1] received from God the Father honour and glory, when there was borne such a voice to him by the Majestic Glory, This is my
18 beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: and this voice we *ourselves* heard borne out of heaven, when

1 Gr. *having received.*

Greeks in honor of two of their deities. Everything done was supposed to be a *mystery*, and hence the name, *Eleusinian Mysteries*. Initiation into the mysteries was considered as one of the most obligatory and sacred of all human rites. In one year, passing from the less mysteries, they were initiated into the greater, and then were called *epoptai* (ἐπόπται), the name implying that they now *look upon, see*, the mysteries. This is the word used by the apostle: we were 'eye-witnesses' of his majesty. Of course, the word is used in a Christian sense, but its use seems to imply that what he and his companions, James and John, saw on the Mount was of the nature of a *secret* or *mystery* to which *they* were admitted, in distinction from the other apostles. **His majesty**—*glory*, as seen on the Mount. The Greek word is the same as was used by Demetrius, the silversmith, who made little portable temples containing an image of Diana: "And her *magnificence* (glory) should be destroyed." (Acts 19: 27.) The glory of Christ, and the glory of the goddess Diana! Wealth of meaning in the one, and shriveled poverty in the other! "Nothing but myths," says the unbeliever. "We have not followed artfully wrought myths," says Peter. Let the Christian cling with the confidence of an apostle to the gospel as containing, not fables wrought by "the cunning craftiness" of men, but truth revealed by God himself.

17. For. He now shows, by what he had himself seen on the Mount, that his teaching relative to the coming of Christ was true. **He**—Christ. **Honor and glory.** See Rom. 2: 7, 10. 'Glory'—not the brilliant light which proceeded from the Lord's person (Matt. 17: 2; Mark 9: 3); this was additional to that. It came directly from *God the Father*, and it consisted of the remarkable audible expression of the Father's approval and love—an approval of him not merely as a good man, but as his beloved Son—as his Son in a sense applicable to no other being. **When**, etc.—literally, *such a voice being borne to him.* **From the excellent glory**—*by* instead of 'from.' "All other expositions," says Winer, "are arbitrary." By 'excellent (*sublime*) glory' is meant, not heaven, but God himself, *the exalted Majesty.* (Winer.) **My beloved Son.** The original is very expressive, and cannot be reproduced in good English. With naked literalness it would be: *the Son of me, the beloved.* The idea may be expressed thus: *My Son, who is the beloved.* Whether the words "the Son of God" are used in the Scriptures to express the deity of Christ, or only his Messianic office, has long been a mooted question. It is certain that the Jews understood it as implying equality with God. (John 5: 18.) "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee" (Ps. 2: 7) is clearly applicable to Jesus Christ, as is the entire Psalm; and on the surface of the passage it seems to be taught that the Sonship of Christ had a *beginning*, and if it had a beginning, the beginning may have been at the incarnation (John 1: 14), or at the baptism (Matt. 3: 16, 17), or at the resurrection. (Rom. 1: 4.) In either case it may be only the *declaration* that he was the Son of God which is referred to. He may have been God's Son from eternity, but the declaration or recognition of the fact may have been made in time. See Crit. Note. **In whom**, etc. *On whom I let my pleasure rest* is a more exact expression of the thought; or, *my good pleasure fixed upon him.* (Winer.) See Crit. Notes. The verb expresses the feelings which God had toward him before he came into the world, while the context shows that such are God's feelings still. He who is dis pleased with one on whom God's pleasure is fixed, needs something more than God's goodness: he needs God's mercy.

18. This voice, not the mere sound, they guessing the meaning, but the words. **Which came.** Correctly, we *heard borne* out of heaven (American Revisers); *heard come* (English Revisers; in the margin, *brought*). **We**—Peter, James, and John. Here, unlike what is often the case, the pronoun in the original is expressed, and for emphasis, *we*

19 We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the daystar arise in your hearts:
20 Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation.

19 we were with him in the holy mount. And we have the word of prophecy *made* more sure; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a lamp shining in a [1]dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-
20 star arise in your hearts: knowing this first, that

1 Gr. *squalid.*

ourselves (Rev. Ver.), not some other persons, or perhaps better, we, consciously we, heard it. **When we were with him.** It is when we are in conscious communion with Christ that we feel most deeply the force of the evidence that Christ was and is the special object of God's love. **Holy mount**—not yet certainly known. Mount Tabor has generally had the honor, but without reason. It was more probably an elevation near Mount Hermon. 'Holy': sacred in consequence of the events which occurred.

19. With the last verse he completed his first argument in support of his teaching concerning Christ's power and coming, and he now presents his second argument. The former is based upon what he had seen and heard on the Mount, the latter upon the prophetic Scriptures. **Also** (*and*) stands first in the Greek, and points to this new source of evidence. **A more sure word of prophecy.** Either of two translations is possible: 1. *We have a surer, the prophetic, word.* This makes a direct and strong comparison with something else, and the question arises, With what? With the evidence drawn from what he and two other apostles had *witnessed?* But how could he seem to disparage the strength of the first argument? Was not that decisive, and strongly decisive, of the truthfulness of his teaching? 2. *We have as surer* (more certain), *the prophetic word*, which is an equally correct rendering, and saves from all disparaging contrast with the evidence just given. Peter, then, may be understood as saying: "In consequence of what we saw and heard, and of which miraculous things you yourselves have heard, we may feel that the prophetic word is made more certain; we can have no doubt of the truth of ancient prophecy respecting the future power and coming of Christ." Many other explanations have been given, but while this is not without its difficulties, those have greater ones. **Word.** The apostle groups all the prophecies together, even all the words of the Old Testament, and views them in their unity. To him the ancient Scriptures are as but one harmonious utterance of the Holy Spirit. (Ver. 21.) **Do well**—*are doing well.* He commends their present interest in the word. Then the rejection of the Old Testament, or any part of it, is *ill-doing.* The Christian who has little interest in the "Jewish" Scriptures is quite too ignorant of the relation between the Old Testament and the New Testament. The "Jewish" Scriptures are Christian in the sense that they as truly, though not as exclusively and clearly, as the New Testament, give forth divine music relative to the power and coming of Christ. The student of botany is not uninterested in the roots and stock of a plant. The beauty which is unfolded in the flower depends upon the stock and roots. **To take heed.** It implies, not mere attention, which in itself is merely an act of the intellect, but attention originated and continued in faith. **A light,** *a lamp.* **That shineth**—not, that *shone.* So the Old Testament still gives light. **Dark place**—the times of the Old Testament, or the earlier and less enlightened state of believers, or the world in general as it was then and as it always is, apart from the Bible. The last meaning is to be preferred. **Until**—take heed until. **The day**—omit the article. **Day-star arise.** The Greek word is phosphorus (φωσφόρος, *light-bearer*); not the sun, but the morning-star. Christ is the Morning Star (Rev. 22:16), but here the allusion is not to Christ. **Arise** (above the horizon). The time referred to is probably that of the second coming of Christ, in which, as already seen (1 Pet. 1:13; 4:7, 13), the apostle has so deep an interest. **In your hearts**—not implying that their hearts are now in darkness, but at the second coming the light of Christ will shine so much more brightly that one is justified in using language which seems to imply that their present state is one of darkness—a verse rich in sentiment and beautiful in coloring.

20. Knowing—connected with 'do well to take heed'—thus: to which ye are doing well to take heed, *while ye know*, or, *for ye know.*

21 For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake *as they were* moved by the Holy Ghost.

no prophecy of scripture is of[1] private interpretation.
21 For no prophecy ever [2]came by the will of man: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit.

1 Or, *special*.....2 Gr. *was brought*.

First—of all (1 Tim. 2: 1); first of all, in your recollection or consciousness. (Heb. 10: 34.) **This** (standing first in the Greek) gives greater prominence to what is to follow. It calls attention. **Scripture**—the Old Testament. **Any private interpretation.** Rome easily solves the difficulty which has been supposed to lie in these words. In the Douay Version is this note: "This shows plainly that the Scriptures are not to be expounded by any one's private judgment or private spirit. . . . Some may tell us that many of our divines interpret the Scriptures; they may do so, but they do it always with a submission to the judgment of the Church, and not otherwise." In "The Most Reverend Dr. James Butler's Catechism," revised by four Roman Catholic archbishops of Ireland, is the question: "How do we know with *certainty*. what God has taught?" Answer: "By the authority of his Church." Says Archbishop Spalding ("Miscellanea," p. 392): "The fatal source of all this mischief is the principle of private judgment in matters of religion, in opposition to that of authority. The distracting and disorganizing principle of individuality has set itself up against the great conservative principle of an authority, based on antiquity, and secured from error by divine promise." The interpretation of these words by the Roman Catholic Church is therefore this: that nothing in Scripture is to be explained by any individual for himself. He must take the interpretation made by the "Church," which is the Roman Catholic Church, and only that. As that body has itself often been fearfully convulsed by warring opinions, it follows that the final decision must be made by the pope. However immoral, the pope cannot err in his interpretations of God's holy word, and all other men whatsoever, relinquishing their own judgment, must rest upon his. Even Protestants, while rejecting the Romish view, are not quite agreed as to the meaning; but the best view seems to be this: "*That no prophecy of Scripture is matter of one's own explanation*—that is, the prophets do not *originate* their own prophecies; they receive them entirely from above, as is clear from the fact given in the next verse. Peter, therefore, must be understood as saying nothing whatever relative to *interpreting* the Scriptures.

21. For confirms what he has just said concerning the prophets as not originating prophecy. **The prophecy**—omit 'the'—prophecy in general. **Came not**—or, better, *was never borne*—**in old time. By the will of man.** Not the human will, but the Holy Spirit, was the source of prophecy; yet the Holy Spirit did not impart the spirit of prophecy to men, not even to Christian men, in general; but, as we learn from other Scriptures, to comparatively few, and these were **holy men of God. Were moved**—*borne by*. They were not, strictly speaking, passive, for each prophet showed, in the style of language in which he uttered his prophecies, his own mental peculiarities. 'Holy men of God' (ἅγιοι θεοῦ ἄνδρωποι), is regarded by textual critics as of inferior authority to *men from God* (ἀπο θεοῦ ἄνδρωποι). Westcott and Hort adopt this text. Assuming this as the correct reading, we should have the translation, *but borne by the Holy Spirit, men spake from God.*

CRITICAL NOTES.—CHAPTER I.

1. The student who has not access to the work may desire to become acquainted with what Cremer says ("Lexicon of New Testament Greek") concerning this much disputed word, δικαιοσύνη (*righteousness*). "The righteousness of God is a state called forth by God's act of justification—namely, by judicial disengagement, or release from all that stands in the way of δίκαιος εἶναι" (*becoming righteous*), "a liberation of which man becomes partaker by means of faith. Hence, δικ. πίστεως" (*righteousness of faith*). "Rom. 4: 11-13, ἐκ πίστεως" (*from faith*); "Rom. 9: 30; 10: 6, to which expressions the others, δικ. θεοῦ (righteousness of God), ἐκ θεοῦ (righteousness from God)—correspond. Comp. Heb. 11: 7, τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικ. κ. τ. λ." (the righteousness which is by faith, etc.). "We see, therefore, that *the Pauline conception of righteousness*, which,

as to form, always expresses a relation to the judgment of God, includes this special feature—namely, it denotes *the state of the believing man called forth by the divine acquittal*, and this is its force in all the passages in question, Rom. 8: 10; Eph. 6: 14; 4: 24; Rom. 5: 21; 6: 16; 2 Cor. 6: 7, 14, etc. This conception is to be recognized also in 2 Pet. 1: 1, . . . where the absence of the article in ἐν δικ." (*in*, or *through*, *righteousness*), "which is more closely qualified by the following genitive, and therefore cannot be taken adverbially, as in Acts 17: 31, makes it more difficult to understand δικ τ. θ., κ. τ. λ." (righteousness of God, etc.) "as the principle on which it is communicated, and thus as the subjective righteousness of God." It will be noticed that *imparted* righteousness is not at all Cremer's conception. *Righteousness*, or, more specifically, *holiness*, *is imparted* to him who accepts God's righteousness as above explained. *Righteousness*, as taught by Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, is "*reckoned*" (Revised Version) to the sinner, or, to use the old word, which really means scarcely anything different, *imputed*. Righteousness *reckoned* is the foundation of righteousness *imparted*. As the life of God is breathed into the soul at the moment when righteousness is reckoned to it, it is unnecessary to suppose any lapse of time between the reckoning of righteousness and the imparting of righteousness. For aught we know, the two acts may be simultaneous, but their natures are different.

1. τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστου (*our God and Saviour Jesus Christ*). It will be noticed that the Greek for *Saviour* has no article. Our God and *the* Saviour would have made it quite certain that two persons are meant, God the Father and also the Saviour Jesus Christ. Does the absence of the article prove that two distinct persons are *not* meant? and may we infer from this absence our Saviour's deity? Reply: The exact reason why Greek writers use the article, or do not use it, cannot always be given. To make, therefore, an important doctrine, like that of the deity of Christ, turn on the presence or the absence of the article is seldom to be justified. Still, as has been affirmed by learned grammarians, it is grammatically possible in the passage under consideration to refer θεοῦ (*God*) as well as σωτῆρος (*Saviour*) to Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (*Jesus Christ*)—that is, there is nothing in the construction of the Greek language to forbid it. On the other hand, it is remarkable that Peter nowhere else, if here, applies θεός (*God*) to Jesus Christ. Expositors differ concerning the question. The weight of critical authority is against the view that but one is referred to. [It seems to me not only "grammatically possible," but grammatically *natural* to refer θεοῦ as well as σωτῆρος to Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. We need a positive reason for not doing so. The circumstance that Peter does not elsewhere call Jesus Christ *God* is of some weight, but by no means decisive. Yet, as there is this ground for doubt, it is improper to rely on the passage as a proof-text.—A. H.]

5, 7. That ἐπιχορηγήσατε should not be translated *add* but *minister* or *supply*, and that ἐν should be rendered *in* is held by the majority of critical scholars. This is one of the passages used by Trench to illustrate the fact that "our translators do not always seize the precise force of the prepositions." "Tyndale," he says, "had rendered the passage: *In* your faith minister virtue, and *in* your virtue knowledge, etc., and all the translations up to the Authorized had followed him. Henry More ("On Godliness" b. 8; c. 3) has well expressed the objection to the present version: 'Grotius would have (*in*) (ἐν) to be redundant here; so his suffrage is for the English translation. But, for my own part, I think that ἐν is so far from being redundant that it is essential to the sentence, and interposed that we might understand a greater mystery than the mere adding of so many virtues one to another, which would be all that could be expressly signified if ἐν were left out. But the preposition here signifying causality there is more than a mere enumeration of those divine graces. For there is also implied how naturally they rise one out of another, and that they have a causal dependence one of another.' See this thought beautifully carried out in detail by Bengel."

When the passage is correctly understood, the thought is felt to be one of great richness, and the form of expression one of great beauty. No figurative representation of these eight virtues can do justice to the apostle's thoughts. Links of a golden chain; fruits growing on the same tree; faith the root and

CHAPTER II.

BUT there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even

1 But there arose false prophets also among the people, as among you also there shall be false teachers, who shall privily bring in [1]destructive heresies,

1 Or, *sects of perdition.*

love the flower; a building with faith for the foundation and love as the crowning glory; rosary and conjugation of Christian virtues; adjoining colors of the rainbow all coalescing into one bright orb of beauty; a garland of virtues; the divine garden of a Christian heart,—all which metaphors have been used by different writers,—add little to Peter's description. The originality, simplicity, naturalness, and easy flow of the inspired words are remarkable. It is divine music. It is an oratorio surpassing all that the great masters have written. But apart from its beauty and power, to what fullness of Christian character does it incite us! Can it be the work of a forger? The writer cannot refrain from saying, that this one passage (5-7) with the verse following should have saved the Epistle from such severity of treatment as it has received from a Christian scholar of England.

9. The Greek tongue has "two orders of negatives," in the one of which is οὐ (*not*), and in the other of which is μή (*not*). The former denies *directly*, the latter *indirectly*—that is, the latter is used in general when the writer wishes to express supposition or condition. See Winer, p. 453, § 55, and Buttmann, p. 344, § 148. Now, in ver. 9 the negative is μή: For he to whom these things are *not* (who *lacketh* these things), as I am supposing; or to whom these things *may not be;* or, again, in better English, he who *may not* have these things. The use of the conditional *may* brings out with some degree of accuracy the meaning intended to be expressed.

17. *On whom my good pleasure fixed.* The preposition is εἰς (*in*, Common Version and the Revision), whereas in Matthew's own account of the Transfiguration (17:5) it is ἐν (*in*). The variation is worthy of being noticed; for, as it has been well said, it is not the way in which a forger would have acted. He would have kept more closely to his model.

PART II. SECTION FIRST.

Ch. 2. In this section (1-22) are described the character and overthrow of false teachers. Nothing so intensely severe is to be found in the Bible, except in Matt. 23, and in the Epistle of Jude. Jude's fiery bolts are hurled against a similar class of persons, and the terrible woes recorded by Matthew fell from the lips of Christ upon hypocrites. Peter's denunciations crash along through the chapter like successive peals of thunder. A moment's pause at the mention of righteous Noah, just Lot, and the forbearing angels, and the thunder peals forth again more terrifically than ever. That in this respect the Epistle differs greatly from the First Epistle is no more evidence that the Epistle was not written by the author of the First, than the great severity of the address in Matt. 23 proves that the address was not uttered by him who delivered the remarkably tender address of John 14.

1. But . . . also—in allusion to the true prophets of former times. 'But' (on the other hand), there arose 'also' (in addition to them) very different prophets. **False prophets.** False brethren (2 Cor. 11:26) were persons who pretended to be real brethren (related by regeneration to Christians); false apostles (2 Cor. 11:13) were men who professed to be apostles, but were not; a false Christ (Matt. 24:24) was a Christ only in pretence, not in fact. By 'false prophets' is meant not, primarily, persons who prophesied false things, but those who falsely professed to be prophets. It implies, however, that such pretenders prophesied false things. **The people**—the Jews of ancient times. (Jer. 5:31; 6:13; 29:9; Isa. 30:10; Ezek. 13:3, 6-9.) This historical fact is introduced to prepare the way for speaking of those who will soon arise among even Christians themselves. **False teachers**—persons who falsely affirmed that they were true teachers. It implies that they taught falsehood. **Even as**—'as' among you also. **Who privily,** etc.—who shall bring in stealthily (slyly). **Damnable**—does not express the meaning. The heresies were heresies of *destruction*, and that because they led to destruction. Here the destruction of those

denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.
2 And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of.

denying even the Master that bought them, bring-
2 ing upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their lascivious doings; by reason of whom the way of the truth shall be evil spoken of.

who were taught may be implied, but chiefly, as is clear from the last clause, of those who taught. The word for 'damnable' is the same as the word there used for *destruction*. **Heresies.** This word, now so commonly used to express false doctrine, has, generally, in the Acts, the simple meaning of *sect* (Acts 5: 17; 15: 5; 24: 5, 14; 26: 5; 28: 22); in the Epistles, party divisions, *sect*, but implying factiousness. (1 Cor. 11: 19; Gal. 5: 20.) In Titus 3: 10, a man that is a heretic is literally a *heretical* (factious) man. In the verse before us, the word seems to be working away from the meaning of *sect*, and to be taking on thus early the meaning of *heresy* in the sense of *false doctrine*, but, implying, of course, the existence of a sect or factious set of men. **Even denying the Lord**—(1 John 2: 23), *denying even the Master*. The Greek for *Lord* (*Master*) is stronger than the word usually so rendered. How freely does he who once himself denied that he knew Jesus, now speak of denying the Master; but from *his* eyes fell hot tears of penitence, while the depth and sincerity of his sorrow even now are manifest by the freedom with which he is willing to associate his former sin with an Epistle which is to be sent to the universal Church. **That bought them**—the participle (ἀγοράσαντα) put first for emphasis: *him who bought* them, the Master, denying. Christ bought them with *a price*. (1 Cor. 6: 20.) The price paid was his *blood* (Rev. 5: 9); *precious* blood. (1 Pet. 1: 19.) These men will themselves profess to have been bought with the blood of Christ, for they are evidently to arise among the members of the churches. Compare Acts 20: 30; 1 John 2: 19. 'That bought them.' See here evidence of a *general* atonement in distinction from a particular atonement. President Hovey ("Manual of Theology and Ethics," p. 351), on Heb. 2: 9 (*that he should taste death for every man*), says that 'every man' (παντός) "must here signify every one of our race, or every believer of our race. The former is the natural meaning, and should therefore be preferred. 2 Peter 2: 1; compare Luke 7: 30; 19: 44; Acts 13: 46; 2 Cor. 2: 15." **And bring.** Omit 'and,' and read *bringing upon*. The clause is connected with the two preceding ones. The *consequence* of smuggling heresies into the churches, and of denying the Lord is, that they bring upon themselves **swift destruction.** In 1: 14 the same word is translated *shortly* (suddenly). Notice the striking twofold use of the word 'destruction': they will stealthily introduce into the churches heresies of destruction; they will bring upon themselves destruction. Their heretical plans may a while have some success, but they themselves will meet the fate they deserve.

2. Pernicious ways—*excesses* (lustful). Their ways will be licentious. It is not easy in every case to separate the origin of error from the origin of immorality. They have a common parentage—opposition to the will of God. In some cases error may seem to be the first born, and in others immorality. The great Church Father, Augustine, said: "To love is to know." **Many.** Compare Matt. 7: 13 ("Many there be which go in thereat"). But there *many* includes all kinds of sinners; here it includes but one kind. And what is saddening, those included are for the most part professing disciples. See 1 Tim. 4: 1; 2 Tim. 2: 17, 18; 3: 1, 6; Tit. 1: 10–14. The early Church suffered from two causes: Ritualism and Gnosticism; the former the outgrowth of deteriorated Judaism, which, overlooking the harmony between the gospel and true Judaism taught by prophets, attempted to engraft Mosaic rites upon Christianity; the latter, the Alexandrian philosophy, which, briefly expressed, was substantially an effort of the human reason to free itself from what it pronounced to be shackles of faith. The germ of these two great errors, more especially of ritualism, was much developed even in the days of the apostles. See Acts 15: 1–32. Hence the frequent allusion to error and errorists. **By reason of whom**—*on account of whom*. 'Whom' may refer both to the false teachers and to those who followed them. **The way of truth**—of *the* truth. Compare John 14: 6 ("I am the way, the truth, and the life"); Acts 13: 10 ("the right ways of the Lord"); 2: 15 ("the right

3 And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not.
4 For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but

3 And in covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose sentence now from of old lingereth not, and their destruction
4 slumbereth not. For if God spared not angels

way"). The way of truth is the gospel viewed as leading to a mode of life conformable to its requirements. **Evil spoken of**—sometimes rendered *blasphemed*.

LESSONS. 1. Do not lose heart at the rise and arrogance of error; 2. Be not surprised that even members of churches should follow after error, and fall into dishonesty or licentiousness; 3. Be yourself firm in the ways of the Lord; 4. Resist the errors and immoralities of others, and do so without fear of being called intolerant. 5. *Many;* no proof of rightness.

3. Through (*in*) **covetousness.** Covetousness, insatiable desire *to have more*, is viewed as the element *in* which they live. A covetous man lives in his covetousness, as a fish lives *in* the water or a bird *in* the air. **Feigned words**—words plastic, words artfully formed and put together for the purpose of deceiving. **Make merchandise**—*cheat*, say some; *make gain of you* is more probably the sense. The real end of their false words is gain. (Rom. 16: 18.) See 1 Tim. 6: 5; Tit. 1: 11. This is deplorable—under the guise of truth to utter falsehood, and that concerning religious things, and then to plaster over with fair words the real purpose—making gain of their fellow church members, and dragging them down to destruction with themselves.

> O cunning enemy, that, to catch a saint,
> With saints dost bait thy hook!

Whose judgment—for whom *the* judgment, the *condemnation* (implying punishment). **Now of a long time**—no Greek for *now*, though perhaps necessary to bring out the exact meaning. **Lingereth not.** The contradiction between 'long time' and 'lingereth not' is only apparent. The sense is: Long ago, in anticipation of their errors, excesses, and enticements, God's purpose to punish them had real existence, and that purpose has never been withdrawn. It has hastened on with every revolving period. It has not lingered, and the consummation is as certain as if it had already taken place. **Damnation**—*destruction;* the same word in the original as in ver. 1 (twice). See above on 'damnable heresies.' God's delay in punishing the wicked is a fact which arrested the attention of distinguished pagan writers in ancient times, and is considered at some length in the Book of Job. The actual infliction of punishment is often delayed, but the condemnation, and even the destruction, in so far as it is purposed, *is not delayed* ('lingereth not'). Disapproval, in the strong form of condemnation, flashes instantly upon the committal of the wrong. Much of the Hebrew poetry is characterized by what is called "Parellelism of Members." One form of the peculiarity consists in the repetition of nearly the same thought in equivalent words. This has been called "Synonymous Parallelism." Ps. 144: 6 is an example: "Cast forth lightning, and scatter them; shoot out thine arrows, and destroy them." Instances of Parallelism are found in prose: "There is nothing covered that shall not be revealed; and hid that shall not be known." In like manner the last two clauses of the verse before us give an instance of Parallelism. 'Destruction' corresponds with '*condemnation*,' and '*slumbereth not*' with '*lingereth not*.' The style rises toward the poetic.

4. The apostle fortifies his declaration that the false teachers shall meet with deserved punishment; and this he effects by the case: 1. Of sinning angels; 2. Of the ungodly antediluvians; 3. Of Sodom and Gomorrah. From the fate of these three classes it is certain that punishment will be visited upon those described. **For** connects the illustrations with that which is to be illustrated. I affirm it to be so, *for* facts which occurred under the government of God in past ages prove it.

FIRST ILLUSTRATION. **If,** as so often before, is not expressive of doubt. 'If' (as is the case) **God spared not,** etc. See Rom. 8: 22 ("He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up" *to death*); the same verbs, but how different the end! The Son was delivered to suffering for our sins; sinning angels were delivered to punishment on account of their own sins: the Son beloved; sinning angels the objects of holy wrath. How tragical the application of the same words, *spared*

cast *them* down to hell, and delivered *them* into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment;
5 And spared not the old world, but saved Noah the eighth *person*, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly;

when they sinned, but [1] cast them down to [2] hell, and committed them to [3] pits of darkness, to be re-
5 served unto judgment; and spared not the ancient world, but preserved Noah with seven others, [4] a preacher of righteousness, when he brought a flood

1 Or, *cast them into dungeons*.....2 Gr. *Tartarus*.....3 Some ancient authorities read *chains*.....4 Gr. *a herald*.

not and delivered, to the Holy Redeemer as are applied to spirits so proud and rebellious! **That sinned**—*when* they sinned, they having already sinned. The sinning was before the sparing not. See Critical Note on 1 Pet. 3: 20: "Who sometime were disobedient." Silence respecting the nature of their sin is a lesson for us. A more groundless view is scarcely possible than that the sin consisted in impurity of conduct with the daughters of men. (Gen. 6: 2.) Nothing more definite can be said than that they kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation (Jude 6), on which see comments. **Cast them down to hell**—one word in the Greek, and that a participle (ταρταρώσας, *having tartarized them*, sent them to Tartarus). It is found nowhere else in the Scriptures. Tartarus is a word of pagan origin. In the earlier writers, it was "a dark abyss, as deep below hades as earth below heaven; prison of Saturn, the Titans, etc. Later, Tartarus was either the *nether-world* generally, like hades, or *the regions of the damned*, as opposed to the Elysian fields." (Liddell and Scott.) No such conceptions are embraced in the word as used by our apostle; and on the other hand, it is not used to express an intermediate state, answering to the supposed intermediate state of the righteous. An intermediate state of either the righteous or the wicked, in any other sense than that of a state in which the spirit is not yet in its resurrection body, and has not yet passed through the ordeal of the general judgment, and may not, therefore, have received that full weight of either bliss or suffering which is probably connected with the repossession of the body, is not taught in the Scriptures. As used by Peter, the word probably means that they were *cast down to hades*, which, as used in the New Testament, is not the place of disembodied spirits, good and bad (the earlier conception of the Hebrews and the Greeks), but the place of *future, endless, punishment.* **Chains**—according to a weightier reading, *caverns* or *pits*. **Of darkness**—a most expressive and solemn metaphor. It shows the utter separation of these fallen spirits from the light of God. Jude (6), speaking of the same beings, says "*chains* (bonds) *under darkness*"; but the original word is not the same as the commonly-received Greek here. **To be reserved**—*reserved* (the more approved reading), *i. e.*, now reserved, or kept; they are *being reserved.* **Unto judgment.** Jude says: "*Judgment of the great day.*" See Matt. 25: 41. In the days of our Lord demons cried out, "Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" (Matt. 8: 29.) That is, before the general judgment. They seem to know that they are hereafter to be *publicly* judged, and delivered over to a more fearful punishment. All questioning relative to the harmony of the two views—that the fallen angels have already been sent to a place of punishment, and that they are to be judged hereafter—is as useless as similar questioning relative to impenitent men, who are also to be judged publicly after having been consigned to punishment. The question is not one that concerns us. All is known to God.

5. SECOND ILLUSTRATION.—**The old world**—*the ancient world*, the antediluvians, with the exceptions about to be mentioned; all the men of the period immediately preceding the flood. **Saved**—*preserved*, so that he was neither swept away with the others, nor in danger of it. **Noah the eighth**—a peculiar way of saying, *Noah with seven others.* (Buttmann.) See 1 Pet. 3: 20. The keeping of the few is contrasted with the destruction of the many. In every age the majority have been ungodly; whether it will ever be otherwise depends upon the purpose of God; though it should be added that the godly are required to put forth to the utmost their own free powers to bring the ungodly to knowledge of the way in which they may become godly. **A preacher of righteousness**—a *proclaimer* (herald) to the men of his time (1 Pet. 3: 19), not of the righteousness which is distinctively that of the gospel (1: 1; Rom. 1: 17; 3: 22, 25, 26), but of that which consisted of faith in the one God, of reverence for his

6 And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes condemned *them* with an overthrow, making *them* an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly;
7 And delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked:

6 upon the world of the ungodly; and turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes condemned them with an overthrow, having made them an ex-
7 ample unto those that should live ungodly; and delivered righteous Lot, sore distressed by the lascivi-
8 ous life of the wicked (for that righteous man

character, and of readiness to believe all that God might see fit to make known. That was the righteousness which Noah preached, but see Heb. 11: 7 for the representation of what he himself became. The ungodly were not destroyed till after they had been permitted to listen to faithful preaching. **Bringing in.** There is no Greek for 'in.' The connection may be expressed thus: Saved Noah *when* he brought the flood. Noah's deliverance is not a necessary part of the illustration. His case could have been passed in silence, and the illustration have been equally pertinent; but strength is gained by putting in contrast the antediluvians and the patriarch. This is one of the passages (the other, Matt. 24: 37-39) which Prof. George Rawlinson regards as teaching with special emphasis the *universality* of the Flood.

6. THIRD ILLUSTRATION.—Overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah. It is unnecessary to suppose that the Dead Sea was formed at the time of the overthrow of these cities. That supposition, formerly held, is without support. A recent opinion puts the cities at the northern end of the sea, but, unless some further investigation compel the adoption of that view, the opinion that they were at the southern end must stand. It was a matter of no consequence to Peter at which end they stood. The point with him was the illustration which their overthrow gave of the certainty that the false and licentious teachers which were soon to arise would be also destroyed. **Turning . . . into ashes**—*having burnt to ashes.* The original is one word, a participle coming from a noun which means *ashes.* The way in which this was done is not given. It might have been done by miraculous or by providential means; the former is probable. It was God's act, by whatever means effected. **With an overthrow**—*to* an overthrow. But the Greek word for overthrow (καταστροφῇ) is rejected by Westcott and Hort; the Revisers retain it. The overthrow is that *to which* the cities were condemned. The punishment, however, was not chiefly the destruction of material structures nor temporal death. The latter might have been followed by eternal life, in which case the burning of the towns and the shortening of life ought to have thrilled heaven with new joy. **An ensample unto**—*an example unto.* See comments on "are set forth for an example" in Jude 7. A different construction may be the correct one: An example *of.* Then the sense would be, that in respect to punishment the people of Sodom and Gomorrah were made a *specimen* of ungodly men, and will continue to be such in all following time.

7. Neither is this deliverance of Lot a necessary part of the third illustration, but, as in the second, it gives force to the view presented. The writer might have said, with less amplification: If sinning angels were cast down to hell, if the ancient world was destroyed by a flood, and if Sodom and Gomorrah were reduced to ashes, how much more will false and dissolute teachers be punished; but, fruitful in thought and intense in feeling, he gives a higher coloring to his description of both classes of sinners by contrasting them respectively with Noah and Lot. He might as well have set off the sin of the angels by contrasting with it the steadfastness of unfallen angels. As he advances, however, he grows warmer and strikes off into contrasts. **Delivered**—*rescued; snatched away* is scarcely too strong. **Just**—*righteous.* The word is akin to that which is rendered righteousness in ver. 5, upon which see comments. **Vexed**—*worn down.* These were a very troublesome, harassing set of sinners. They were far enough from being Pharisees. They sinned openly and audaciously. That Lot lived with them so long is remarkable, and that he lived among them so long with no essential injury, is still more remarkable. The false teachers of apostolic times drew away many from the faith; Lot withstood all the people of four cities. **The filthy conversation**—*the licentious conduct.* **The wicked**—strictly, *the lawless*, men who defied all law, human and divine. See a description of "thy sister Sodom" in Ezek. 16: 49, 50. On

8 (For that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed *his* righteous soul from day to day with *their* unlawful deeds:)
9 The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished:
10 But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and despise government. Pre-

dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, [1] vexed *his* righteous soul from day to day with *their* law-
9 less deeds): the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to keep the unrighteous
10 under punishment unto the day of judgment; but chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of defilement, and despise dominion. Daring, self-

1 Gr. *tormented.*

the expression, "full of bread" in Hamlet, a commentator on Shakespeare says: "Shakespeare found this remarkable expression in the Bible: 'Behold this was the iniquity of thy sister Sodom: pride, *fulness of bread*, and abundance of idleness was in her and in her daughter.'"

8. This verse is an expansion of the thought expressed in the second member of verse 7. **In seeing and hearing** stands first in the Greek, and therefore is emphatic. The sinners were so numerous that he could not help seeing them, and so noisy that he could not help hearing them. Not to see and hear was impossible. The impression made, however, by the entire passage is, that he was not wholly silent. He must sometimes have protested against their wickedness. **Dwelling among them**—sad that he continued to do so; yet his righteous life, continually before them, was necessary to give a climax to their guilt. **Vexed**—*tormented.* He was so impressed with the conviction of their lawlessness and impurity, that his righteous soul *was tormented*, and that from day to day. Peter uses the active verb, perhaps to indicate that Lot could not allow himself to sink down into passive indifference to their sin, as if it were so great that all feeling concerning their state was useless. 'Vexed' (imperfect tense) indicates a continuous state. The good man was continually plagued, and as no other man of that region was.

9. The first clause accounts for Lot's rescue. (Ver. 7.) The Lord *knew how* to do it, yet it is expressed in the general form so as to be applicable to all tempted saints. The Lord knows *how*—sometimes in one way and sometimes in another. **To deliver**—*to rescue;* the same in the Greek as in verse 7. **Godly**—the opposite of *ungodly* in ver. 5, 6; those whose hearts are right toward God (under the control of reverence and love). **Temptation.** An edition of the Bible, 1867, by the American Bible Society, prints in the plural number; a small New Testament of the same year, by the same Society, prints in the singular number. The latter is correct. **And** (*but*) **to reserve.** Here, at last, the apostle connects the thought, though not even now strictly the words, with the thought in verse 4: For if God spared not sinning angels, antediluvians, and Sodomites, how much less will he spare the false teachers. Yet he expresses his thought not so definitely, but generally—**the unjust. To be punished**—not future. They are are even now undergoing punishment. *To keep them under punishment.* (Revised Version.) The Lord *knows how* to keep wicked men for the Day of Judgment and under punishment. From this point onward the writer speaks of the errorists as if they had already come; not, as in verse 1, as if they were to arise in some future time. It is clear, therefore, that the evils against which he is warning the churches have already begun to appear, while it is equally clear that they will continue for a considerable period in the future.

10. A definite description of the overthrow of the false teachers, with a description of their character. The latter extends to the end of the chapter. **But chiefly.** It contrasts the weight of punishment which will fall on the baser kind of sinners with that which will be visited upon the less base kind. (Ver. 9.) **After the flesh**—literally, *behind the flesh*, an original use of the preposition (ὀπίσω). It is commonly used with respect to persons. Jude (ver. 7) uses it as it is used here (going *after*, *behind*, strange flesh). It is the same word as is used in Matt. 10: 38 (and followeth *after* me), and in 1 Tim. 5: 15 (turned aside *after* Satan). It implies that what is followed after is a leader; that he who follows after is a disciple or partisan. The errorists *are led* by the flesh instead of *leading it;* they follow after it, go behind it, as their leader. **Flesh**—their nature viewed as depraved, and acting through the body. **Lust of unclean-**

sumptuous *are they*, selfwilled, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities.
11 Whereas angels, which are greater in power and might, bring not railing accusation against them before the Lord.
12 But these, as natural brute beasts made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not; and shall utterly perish in their own corruption;
13 And shall receive the reward of unrighteousness,

11 willed, they tremble not to rail at [1] dignities: whereas angels, though greater in might and power, bring not a railing judgment against them before the Lord.
12 But these, as creatures without reason, born [2] mere animals [3] to be taken and destroyed, railing in matters whereof they are ignorant, shall in their [4] destroying surely be destroyed, suffering wrong as the
13 hire of wrong-doing; *men* that count it pleasure to

1 Gr. *glories*.....2 Gr. *natural*.....3 Or, *to take and to destroy*.....4 Or, *corruption*.

ness—*in* which as the element of their life they walk. The *habit* of depravity in the form of lustful excesses is spoken of as a *walk*. **Government**—*dominion*, probably all kinds of human dominion. They despise all government except that of their own lusts!—not unknown now. That the devil is meant cannot be shown. Compare Jude 8. **Presumptuous**—*audacious, bold*. **Self-willed.** These audacious men are self-willed—a humiliating fact. **Not afraid to speak evil,** etc.—*of dignities they do not fear to speak evil.* At the thought of doing that they never tremble. What is meant by 'dignities' is uncertain. The opinions of expositors greatly differ. The translation of the word in many other places is *glory*. The margin of the Revised Version, *glories*. It is hazardous to speak definitely when there is so little ground even for conjecture. The interpretation of the word has been made by some to turn on the meaning of Jude, ver. 8, 9, which are themselves, especially the latter, too difficult to yield much help. It is upon the ground of those verses that some understand by *dignities* the devil, or at least demons. But that meaning must be rejected. It may possibly refer to the glories of the Father and the Son, but even that has little to support it. It may refer to beings who are high in earthly official glory; possibly, to all glorious religious things.

11. Whereas is not to be taken as expressing contrast; it is nearly equivalent to *while:* while the heretics had a given spirit, angels had an opposite spirit. **Angels**—good angels. **Greater**—than the self-willed, audacious heretics. **Railing accusation**—*railing judgment.* **Against them**—against dignities. Some say, against the false teachers. **Before the Lord**—in the Lord's presence. The angels, though so superior, have sufficient humility to abstain from such severity of spirit, however wanting in the best elements of character some earthly rulers may be. But the Greek for 'before the Lord' is deemed by some as not belonging to the true text. It is accepted by the Revisers, but Westcott and Hort mark it as an alternative reading, and think it impossible to decide which reading should be adopted.

12. But these—the teachers of error in contrast with the good angels. **As natural brute beasts,** etc.—*as irrational creatures, born naturally* (with animal natures) for the very purpose of being captured and destroyed. A marginal reading in the Revised Version: *to take and to destroy.* The comparison, which is striking, implies that these men have lowered themselves to a level with brutes, and have fitted themselves to be destroyed, even as the latter are fitted by nature to be taken. See Crit. Notes. **Speak evil,** etc.—*railing in things of which they are ignorant.* If the interpretation of 'government,' 'dignities,' and 'them' (ver. 11) is correct, it follows that the things of which they are ignorant pertain to earthly rulers. They have not been in the way of knowing much concerning political government and political rulers, and were there no other reason, that is sufficient to show the wickedness of their railing. **Shall utterly perish**—*shall in their destructivenes be destroyed*, is an approximation to the play upon words found in the Greek. According to valuable manuscripts, *even* (καὶ), *surely*, Revised Version, is the correct reading; shall *surely* be destroyed.

13. And shall receive—not a new element of punishment so much as the result of the punishment expressed in the closing words of ver. 12. The sense is: shall perish in their own corruption, *thus receiving, as they will, the reward of unrighteousness.* All unrighteousness has reward (reward *for* iniquity), but how different from the reward obtained for righteousness! Compare the case of Abel (Heb. 11:4); Enoch (Heb. 11:5); Moses, (Heb. 11:24-26.) Judas was the cause of a field being pur-

as they that count it pleasure to riot in the daytime. Spots *they are* and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings while they feast with you;
14 Having eyes full of adultery, and that cannot cease from sin; beguiling unstable souls: a heart

revel in the day-time, spots and blemishes, revelling in their [1] deceivings while they feast with you
14 having eyes full of [2] adultery, and that cannot cease from sin; enticing unstedfast souls; having a heart

1 Some ancient authorities read *love-feasts*.....2 Gr. *an adulteress.*

chased with *the* "reward of iniquity" (Acts 1:18), with wages obtained by iniquity. A small field; a great price. So these heretics will receive great (terrible) pay for their heresy and vice. **As they that count,** etc., (a participle), *accounting reveling by day a pleasure.* **Day**—may be equivalent to *daily;* it may express *transientness* in contrast with eternal duration; or it may stand in contrast with *night.* If the last is correct, the men are sunk so low, that, unlike those that were drunken in the night (1 Thess. 5:7), they revel in the day. **In the day**—(ἐν ἡμέρᾳ) stands between *the* (τὴν) and *riot* (τρυφήν) *the-in-day riot,* and may therefore in Greek usage be adjectival (the *daily* riot). See Buttmann, p. 331. **Spots they are.** The introduction by King James' Revisers of unnecessary words into the intense and vivacious style of this chapter is unfortunate. Says the writer, wrought up to the highest pitch of Christian indignation: *spots and stains, reveling in their own deceivings* (not *sporting themselves with*), while they feast with you. Few connective particles are used, but the writer drives on with a rattling rapidity of words which is like the clashing of battle-axes. **Deceivings.** Jude says (ver. 12), "*feasts of charity,*" but in letters and sound the Greek word is remarkably like the word used here. Peter says: *apatais*; Jude, *agapais.* It has been considered either with Peter or with Jude (which ever wrote first) as a play of words. It should be added that, according to some important manuscripts, Peter used the same word as Jude. Westcott and Hort are unable to decide, but have put the word for (ἀπάταις) *deceivings* in the text, and for *love-feasts* (ἀγάπαις) in the margin. **While they feast,** etc. Jude (ver. 12) restricts it to "love-feasts," concerning which see comments; but Peter uses a more general word, which may include the Lord's Supper, love-feasts, and ordinary social festivals. These graceless heretics had a fascinating power of deception. They did not "wear their hearts upon their sleeves." Adroit in address, they were able to smother every spark of suspicion in those whom they purpose to gain to their lustful and avaricious ends. Such gross forms of evil are now so wanting in evangelical churches that it is difficult to see how they could have arisen so early. When the veil is lifted from European Church life in not a few of the ages preceding the Reformation, evils are to be seen which are scarcely if at all less.

14. This verse continues the description. **Eyes full of adultery.** Here, too, the manuscripts differ, but preponderate strongly in favor of the word meaning *adulteress: eyes full of an adulteress.* Not any given woman can be meant, but the singular stands as the representative of a class. So impure are the heretics that their eyes, so to speak, are filled with an adulteress. They can see nothing else. An adulteress is pictured on the retina—that is, their association of ideas and feelings is habitually lustful. The impurity is in the heart, yet the impure do undoubtedly often betray their real character in the eye.

> A sin prevailing much in youthful men,
> Who give their eyes the liberty of gazing.

That organ which was intended to illustrate so signally the wisdom of the Creator is transformed by the inward power of lust into a tell-tale mirror. **That**—refers to *eyes.* It is the eyes that cannot cease from sin. The writer uses but one word where, perhaps, the English requires three or four, and that one an adjective: eyes *unceasing* from sin. Eyes *soiled, stained,* by sin, would be the rendering of the word found in some of the manuscripts. The student will find the relative value of the two readings considered in Buttmann's "Greek Grammar" p. 65. The sin is that to which the context refers. The eyes retain the picture because the mind retains its impurity. **Beguiling**—*ensnaring,* as a man may snare a bird or bait a fish. **Unstable** (3:16), in that they are not firmly fixed on Christ as the foundation. (1 Pet. 2:6, 8.) The snares and the ensnared—what a meeting must it be at the Day of Judgment! The latter were not necessarily weak in intellect;

they have exercised with covetous practices; cursed children:
15 Which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam, *the son* of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness;
16 But was rebuked for his iniquity: the dumb ass

15 exercised in covetousness; children of cursing; forsaking the right way, they went astray, having followed the way of Balaam the *son* of [1]Beor, who
16 loved the hire of wrong-doing; but he was rebuked for his own transgression: a dumb ass spake with

1 Many ancient authorities read *Bosor*.

the former were so bad that suspicion and resistance ought to have been awakened. "I was enticed:" that you played the fool is equally true. **A heart . . . exercised with covetous practices**—*having a heart trained in covetousness.* (Isa. 56: 11.) The word for trained (γεγυμνασμένην) is that from which our word *gymnastic* is derived. It came from a word meaning *naked* (gymnos); for those who among the Greeks were *gymnastics* practiced nearly naked. These men were gymnastics in covetousness. The heart was trained to it. A man who is covetous by nature may yet be so unconscious of the sin, as to put himself through a course of training which will make him an athlete in the detestable vice. Most persons who are of penurious disposition are totally unconscious of the fault, and were they charged with it would resent it with great spirit. **Cursed children**—literally, *children of a curse.* See on 1 Pet. 1: 14.

15. Which have forsaken—*forsaking* (the better reading) **the right way.** *They went astray* brings out the relation of the first clause (participial) to the second. And now Peter recalls from the ancient history of the Jews the case of one who was also for the most part a false prophet; for the most part, for the history shows that Balaam was not a mere heathen diviner. Though born and living among idolaters, he had in some way acquired some knowledge of the true God; for in talking with the servants of Balak, he used the peculiar name of the true God, Jehovah (Num. 22: 8, 18, Common Version, *Lord*), in distinction from the name applied also to pagan gods. It is clear that Jehovah made to him for a definite purpose a few isolated revelations (Num. 22: 12, 20; 23: 5-10, 16-24; 24: 2-9, 15-19), but he was never called to the *office* of a prophet. Professionally, he was a diviner or magician after a heathen pattern. For that reason, the comparison between him and the false prophets of Peter's time could be justly made. (Jude 11; Rev. 2: 14.) **The way of Balaam**—his *manner of life* was crooked; the way which the heretics forsook was *the right way* (a *straight* way). They followed Balaam's way in that they uttered, as he generally did, falsehood, were impure as he was (Num. 31: 16, compare with Num. 25: 1-3), and were covetous. Balaam's superiority to the love of money was *put on.* He must have been known as receiving pay for his services in the art of divining, or Balak would not have sent him the rewards of divination. (Num. 22: 7.) He *wanted* to go with the messengers, but knew that Jehovah might not permit it. See the history. (Num., chapters 22-24.) Peter knew that, whatever were his pretensions, he **loved wages of unrighteousness.** It is a striking fact that these very words were used by Peter in his address to the "men and brethren" who were assembled in Jerusalem after the ascension. (Acts 1: 18.) So far it is evidence that Peter was the writer of this Epistle. **Son of Bosor**—son of *Beor.* (Num. 22: 5.) The *s* is believed to have arisen from a peculiar way of pronouncing the second consonant of the Hebrew form of the word. The Revisers: *Beor;* in the margin, *Bosor*, the latter having considerable ancient support.

16. But hints that he was not allowed to be his own master in wrong-doing; but **was rebuked.**

> And that should teach us,
> There's a divinity that shapes our ends,
> Rough-hew them how we will.

Yet Balaam's "indiscretion" did not serve him "well"—it served the Lord's purpose well. **His iniquity**—his *own* iniquity; and by this is meant his desire to serve Balak by cursing Israel for pay. Balaam's was a case of informal, conditional contract. There was no direct and positive agreement between him and Balak; yet the course taken was scarcely less criminal than if he had said: "I will go and curse, and you shall pay so much for the work done." Such "indirection" of contract may be specially mean; for, while it shows purpose to effect a given end, it provides, in selfishness, a loop-hole of escape. **The dumb ass speaking.** (Num. 22: 28-30.) The denial of a miracle here would logically lead to the

speaking with man's voice forbade the madness of the prophet.
17 These are wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest; to whom the mist of darkness is reserved for ever.
18 For when they speak great swelling *words* of vanity, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, *through much* wantonness, those that were clean escaped from them who live in error.
19 While they promise them liberty, they themman's voice and stayed the madness of the prophet.
17 These are springs without water, and mists driven by a storm; for whom the blackness of darkness
18 hath been reserved. For, uttering great swelling *words* of vanity, they entice in the lusts of the flesh, by lasciviousness, those who are just escaping from
19 them that live in error; promising them liberty,

denial of a miracle everywhere else, and thus, in the end, revealed religion would be reduced to natural religion—that is, would be shorn of reality. But does it teach (to use the language of the schools) a *subjective*, or an *objective*, act?—that is, was the miracle performed directly upon the subject, Balaam? or, was it done upon the object, the animal? It is one thing to work a miracle upon Balaam's *ears*, so that he shall seem to hear articulate sounds coming from the animal, and another thing to work a miracle on the *braying powers* of the beast, so that its braying shall become articulate human sounds. If the former is the true view, Peter has taken an odd way to express it, for he says, 'the dumb ass speaking,' *he spoke* **with a man's voice.** In reply to all objections, it is sufficient to say to one who believes at all in miracles, that it was no more difficult for God to utter thought through the mouth of the ass in the words of men, than to stop men, as he once did, from talking in a given language and cause them to talk in another. The ass wastes no words, but—which is more than can be said of some preachers—speaks with directness and force. **Forbade the madness of the prophet**—*repressed* it. His madness was not insanity, but perverseness, downright folly concerning religious things. See another allusion to Balaam in Rev. 2: 14, with Dr. J. A. Smith's notes in his "Commentary on Revelation."

17. The apostle continues the description of the false teachers. **Wells without water.** A well of water in Palestine, and other Oriental lands, was formerly deemed one of the best of earthly things. (Prov. 10: 11; Isa. 58: 11; John 4: 6.) These immoral errorists were dry wells. They had no truth, no grace, and therefore no power of refreshment. Such men, however, in our own day, are believed by their admirers to be wells full of water, sweet and medicinal withal. **Clouds**—according to the true reading, *mists;* mists **carried** (*driven*) **with** (*by*) **a tempest.** It expresses restlessness, want of stability. (James 1: 8.) One error leads to another, and this to yet another. (Eph. 4: 14.) The errorist has no anchorage. The feverish instability of one who is not grounded on eternal truth is incurable, except by the grace of God. The consequence: **to whom the mist** (the blackness) **of** (*the*) **darkness.** See 2: 4, 'chains (pits?) of darkness'! There is weighty manuscript authority for rejecting the words **forever** (εἰς αἰῶνα) from the text. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort, do not retain it. Nor do the Revisers adopt it.

18. For. The apostle illustrates the emptiness of the wells and the unstableness of the clouds. **When they speak**—*speaking*, a participle with which the verb **allure** is connected. **Great swelling words of vanity**—literally, *overswellings of vanity.* Inelegant modern phrase would call them *great swells.* They abounded in high sounding words, but these were as empty of ideas as many of the wells of ancient Palestine were empty of water in the days of our apostle. Their words were even vanity itself. In the utterance of their emptiness, they had as their aim the enticement of others, but this was accomplished **through** (rather *in*) **the lusts of the flesh**—they *lived in* lust. **Through much wantonness**—not put in apposition with 'lusts of the flesh.' Our translators sought to express the plural (ἀσελγείαις) *debaucheries* by means of **much. Clean escaped**—*a little escaping, barely* escaping. He probably refers to persons who had very recently professed conversion. **In error**—of life, the yet unconverted. These converts, when just beginning to escape from the influence of the surrounding depravity, are enticed by these pretended Christians, these impure heretics. 'Clean (*really*) escaped' (ὄντως ἀποφεύγοντας) has much less right in the text than the words for a *little* escaping (ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας), on *the point* of doing so. The latter has been adopted by many well-known scholars.

19. While they promise—*promising*, connected, like speaking, with 'allure' (ver. 18):

selves are the servants of corruption: for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage.

20 For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning.

21 For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known *it*, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them.

while they themselves are bondservants of corruption; for of [1] whom a man is overcome, of the same
20 is he also brought into bondage. For if, after they have escaped the defilements of the world through the knowledge of [2] the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein and overcome, the last state is become worse with them
21 than the first. For it were better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after knowing it, to turn back from the holy com-
22 mandment delivered unto them. It has happened

1 Or, *what*.....2 Many ancient authorities read *our*.

they allure, promising liberty. The dry well! the pompous but empty words! The liberty promised was liberty to yield to unbridled indulgence of passion. Contrast the words of Christ. (John 8: 32, 36.) This wretched working of evil, beginning in the times of the apostles, has often been repeated. In the history of a body, which, for the most part, has been only a politico-priestly organization, are some saddening illustrations: and in our own country are individuals and communities of whom the description in this verse is too true. **The servants**—*bond-servants*. The original is the word used by the Greeks for *slave;* and were *slave* used here, it would scarcely overmatch in strength the other terms of the description. **For of whom.** *By what* is grammatically possible. It is the expression of a general fact, and has often been verified in war. (1 Sam. 17: 9.) It is here applied to the heretical teachers. That in their case *corruption* may be held as the overcoming power is a consideration in favor of *by what*. They are overcome by their own corruption. Hence it is said they are the 'servants' of corruption.

20. For. The point is contained in the last clause, and, corresponding with the final clause of ver. 19, is intended to explain it, but it is a step in advance. The bondage is such that the false teachers are in a worse state than at first. **If.** As Huther has neatly expressed it, the reality, as often, is expressed hypothetically. **The pollutions.** *Miasms* is the Greek transferred into English; yet it must not be supposed that the writer used the term with figurative reference to that foulness of the air which the word is now used to express. Its original meaning is *a coloring, staining;* hence, *moral defilement*. **The world**—those who live in wickedness (*error*, ver. 18). **Through (*in*) the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.** See 1: 2, 8. In the knowledge of whom else is escape possible? 'Lord and Saviour' are both connected with 'Jesus Christ,' for there is but one article for both words. The Greek for 'our' (our Lord) is found in some manuscripts. **Therein** stands first in the original for emphasis: *but* (omitted in the Common Version, and even in the Revision) *by these* (pollutions) *having been again entangled, are overcome*. 'Entangled' is highly descriptive. (2 Tim. 2: 4.) A spider's web is not more entangling for the luckless fly than the world's pollutions for unstable souls. **The latter end**—literally, *the last things: the beginning*—*the first things*. That is, the state into which they have come is worse than even their state before supposed conversion. (Matt. 12: 45; Luke 11: 26; Heb. 10: 26, 27.) That in relapsing from the Christian profession the soul becomes harder, even more bitter, than it was, is a fact often observed. Great scoffers are born of re-entanglement in evil.

21. For. The startling statement just made is confirmed, though not by formal proof. **It had been better**—*it were better*. It is a positive, unconditional declaration; there is not the least reason to doubt that it were better. **Not to have known**—and so by implication to be *now* ignorant of. **The way of righteousness** is the way of righteousness which comes by faith in Christ. Compare 'the way of truth' (ver. 2), and 'the right way.' (Ver. 15.) See on 1: 1, especially the Critical Note. **Than (*it is*), after they have known (*it*).** It implies that they know it yet. *The knowledge* of the way has not been lost: they have not relapsed into that state of ignorance in which they once were; that is impossible, however fearfully they have relapsed in profession of interest in the way. **The holy commandment**—essentially equivalent to *the way of righteousness*, but representing the way from a different point—that is, as a way which they were commanded to enter. It

22 But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog *is* turned to his own vomit again; and, The sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.

unto them according to the true proverb, The dog turning to his own vomit again, and the sow that had washed to wallowing in the mire.

CHAPTER III.

THIS second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you; in *both* which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance:

1 This is now, beloved, the second epistle that I write unto you; and in both of them I stir up your

was *holy* in nature and end. **Delivered**—Compare "faith once delivered to the saints." (Jude 3.)

22. But—not a genuine reading. **It is happened**—*it has come to pass.* Literally, *that of* (that contained in) *the true proverb has happened unto them: A dog turning to his own vomit; and, a sow washed, into a wallowing place of mire.* In proverbs brevity and sententiousness were secured by using no verbs. It is almost as if the apostle pointed his finger at them, and exclaimed: "A dog, turning to his own vomit! a washed sow, rushing into and wallowing in the mire!" It is possible that the first was derived from Prov. 26: 11. Both must have been current among the people. "Throughout the whole East 'dog' is a term of reproach for impure and profane persons, and in this sense is used by the Jews respecting the Gentiles (Rev. 22: 15), and by all Mohammedans respecting Christians. . . . We still use the name of one of the noblest creatures in the world as a term of contempt." (Smith's "Bib. Dict.," p. 612.) Compare Matt. 7: 6; Phil. 3: 2.

QUERY: In applying these proverbs to the false teachers, what is the point which the apostle intended to make? The dog *returns* to his vomit and the sow *returns* to the mire. That, clearly, is the chief point; but can no reference to the *nature* of the animals have been intended? and to that, in their common use of them, could the people among whom the proverbs were current have had no reference? On the supposition that the writer believed such impure and deceitful men to have been begotten into spiritual sonship (1 Pet. 1: 3), would he have applied to them such terms as 'dog' and 'sow'? 1 John 2: 19 should be noted. The descriptions of ver. 20 (*escaped*, etc.) and of ver. 21 (*known the* way, etc.), are indeed just such terms as might have been applied to regenerated persons, but there is nothing unreasonable in the supposition that the application was made on the ground of their *appearance*. They once appeared to be renewed persons; they had professed to be such. That would be sufficient to justify such phraseology. The question should be answered, not in support of a theological system, be the system either this or that, but in view of what the word of God teaches. It may seem to be *possible* that regenerated men, falling from grace, may never be restored, and may therefore be forever lost; but a thorough examination of all the passages bearing on the question makes it quite certain that God has made provision for preventing the possibility from ever becoming a fact. Praise to his grace!

CRITICAL NOTE.—CHAPTER II.

12. The Common Version makes **natural** (φυσικὰ) an adjective belonging like **brute** (ἄλογα) to **beasts** (ζῷα), but the four oldest manuscripts have the adjective after the participle **made** (γεγεννημένα), and this reading is adopted by most of the ablest critics. On that ground the above rendering is admissible.

PART II. SECTION SECOND.

Ch. 3. This section warns the readers against the mockers of the final coming of Christ, exhorts to constant expectation of that coming, and, after referring to Paul, urges them to grow in the grace and knowledge of Christ. It is both stimulating and strengthening.

1. This second—a reference to his First Epistle. It aids in confirming the belief that this is not a forgery, but was written by Peter himself. **Beloved**—a touch of affection all the more tender after the resounding of the blows laid upon the heretics. He employs the same loving address in 1 Pet. 2: 11; 4: 12. **Now write. Now** qualifies **second**. This *now second* Epistle; or, this Epistle I write as already the second. **In both which.** Though

2 That ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Saviour:
3 Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts,
4 And saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as *they were* from the beginning of the creation.

2 sincere mind by putting you in remembrance; that
ye should remember the words which were spoken
before by the holy prophets, and the commandment
of the Lord and Saviour through your apostles:
3 knowing this first, that [1]in the last days mockers
shall come with mockery, walking after their own
4 lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his
[2]coming? for, from the day that the fathers fell
asleep, all things continue as they were from the
5 beginning of the creation. For this they wilfully

1 Gr. *in the last of the days*.....2 Gr. *presence*.

the English supplies *both*, it was unnecessary to print it in italics, for *which* being in the plural number, 'both' is necessary to a clear rendering. **Stir up,** etc. See on 1: 13. How the anxiety of the aged apostle repeats itself! His longing heart could not rest till it had poured itself out once more, this time embracing the elect of all lands. (1: 1.) **Pure.** The Greek, a beautiful compound word, literally means, *judged in sunlight.*

2. Here is mentioned that which he desires them to keep in remembrance: **the words spoken before**—in former ages, before the birth of the Saviour. **The holy prophets** were therefore those of the former dispensation. (1: 19-21; 1 Pet. 1: 10-12.) **Us**—rather, *your*, the authority for which is strong. The idea may be expressed thus: and of *your apostles' commandment of the Lord and Saviour*—that is, of the commandment which your apostles received from the Lord. It is a general expression, including himself as well as other apostles. **Commandment.** See on *holy commandment* in 2: 21. **Lord and Saviour**—the same being. (2: 20.) Peter had not, like some in later times, lost his interest in the Old Testament. We learn here also that in authority the writings of the apostles are equal to the gospels. See on 1 Pet. 2: 6.

3. Knowing this first. See on the same phrase in 1: 20. **Last days.** See on 1 Pet. 1: 5. The margin of the Revision says: "Gr. *in the last of the days.*" **Scoffers, mockers**—so rendered, Jude 18. According to the Greek now authorized, *mockers in mockery*—that is, when they mock they are in their element, and the converse is true, that when they are in their element they mock. **Walking after**—(*according to*) **their own lusts**—their customary mode of life. 'Their own'; in the original a strong expression and seldom found in the Greek of the New Testament. It is also used in ver. 16. The persons here mentioned seem to be different from those described in chap. 2, for their characteristic is denial of the second advent of Christ; yet like them they have no piety and indulge in the lowest kind of immorality. Compare 1 Tim. 4: 1; 2 Tim. 3: 1-4.

4. Saying. The spirit of mockery will not restrain itself; it will flash out in taunting words. **Where?**—a more contemptuous form of denying than a direct affirmation. See Mal. 2: 17; Ps. 42: 3. The affirmative, the promise of his coming has failed, would have been too weak to express the spirit of the mockers. Infidelity is a system of stubborn negation; skepticism of contemptuous interrogation. Interrogation often leads to negation. **Of his coming**—Christ's second coming, with special reference to the judgment of the wicked. **For.** Even skepticism can use the language of inspired reasoners, but its reasoning is neither logical nor Scriptural. **The fathers**—the ancestors of the human race, or the founders of the Jewish nation, or the first generation of Christians. The first is the least probable; strong considerations lie against the second; and even the last supposition is not free from difficulty. On the whole is to be preferred those to whom the promise of the second coming was made—that is, the prophets (1: 19 compared with 1: 16; Heb. 1: 1; 1 Pet. 1: 10, 11) of ancient times, to whom may be added all who were in hearty sympathy with them. The connection between **since the fathers fell asleep** and **from the beginning of creation** is not clear. "From the time when the fathers fell asleep" gives one point of departure, and "from the beginning of the creation" gives, apparently, a different point. Perhaps the idea is this: since the fathers fell asleep all things so continue, and indeed all things so continue from the beginning of creation. The argument of the mockers is this: "From the time when the universe was made, nature has swept on its way with great uniformity"; and,

5 For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water:
6 Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished:
7 But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by

forget, that there were heavens from of old, and an earth compacted out of water, and [1]amidst water,
6 by the word of God; by which means the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished:
7 but the heavens that now are, and the earth, by the

1 Or, *through*.

applying this general thought to the case in hand, their argument more specially expressed is, that the uniformity has not been broken since the time when, as Christians affirmed, a promise was made that Christ would come a second time. The question 'Where is the promise of his coming?' is still heard, and, under the broader generalizations of modern discovery, is not less persistently and contemptuously asked than in early Christian times. Even ministers and churches are giving little attention to that blessed event which so fired the heart of our apostle. See on 1 Pet. 4: 7.

5. For. The apostle accounts for their skepticism, and at the same time opposes it. **This**—what follows—**that by the word of God,** etc. **Ignorant** they are, *hidden from* them it is; but their ignorance is voluntary, and voluntary in the largest sense of the word—that is, it implies both an act of the will and a depraved state of the affections. Willing ignorance is conscious ignorance; and this is more nearly universal than most apologizers for human sinfulness are disposed to admit. **That,** etc. The point which Peter makes is this: The creation of the earth, and the attendant material heavens, was effected *by God;* and it was God who, after a long period of apparent sameness in the operations of nature, made a sudden and miraculous change in the condition of the earth and its inhabitants; yet it was unexpected by most of the people then living—nay, they scoffed at it. That change was effected by means of water. However great the disposition to mock, God can, and will, effect another change on the same heavens and earth; and that can be effected by fire. It is at the time of such a change that Christ will come. *The word of God*—not the second person of the Trinity, as in John 1: 1. See Gen. 1: 3, 6, 9, 11, 14, etc. ("And God said.") Speaking was equivalent to acting. Even if it should be conceded that the method in which creation came into being was exclusively by "development," that method would have been an expression of the will of an Intelligent and Almighty Being. **Of old** is to be referred to the beginning of things. (Gen. 1: 1.) **Standing**—*constituted.* "'The earth,' says Peter, 'was *constituted out of* water,' out of the material contained in the water—not, 'rose up out of water.'" **In the water**—*by means of water.* The earth was formed by means of water (Gen. 1: 6, 7, 9, 10)—"*i. e.*, through the action of water, which partly retired to the low places, and partly formed the clouds in the sky." (Winer.) Another view is possible—that water yielded its solid particles for the formation of the earth. The account given by most heathen nations respecting the origin of water and land is very absurd compared with the representation given in the Scriptures.

6. Whereby—*by which* (means). The reference is doubtful, and is the more so because the pronoun is in the plural. It is referred by some to *heavens* and *earth*—by the heavens pouring down their waters, and the earth pouring them forth. But *world* here means *heaven* and *earth.* It is the destruction of the material world, involving, indeed, the destruction of men and animals, to which the writer is referring; and, therefore, he could not have meant to say, by which heavens and earth the heavens and earth were made to perish. Some say: *In consequence of which arrangement of things.* Others refer it to *water*, and account for the plural by making a double reference to water "as the material out of which water was formed, and to water as the means by which the earthy part of the globe was made," or, as Huther adds, "which is more natural, to the word of God as well as to water, so that *whereby* (δι' ὧν) is to be translated, *by which things.*" **Overflowed . . . perished**—not annihilated, but changed. The change was miraculous. It did not occur as a mere development of natural law. It was effected by the direct touch of the hand of God, breaking up the natural order of things. See Crit. Notes.

7. But contrasts destruction by water and destruction by fire. **The heavens,** etc. 'The

the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.

8 But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day *is* with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.

same word have been [1]stored up for fire, being reserved against the day of judgment and destruction of ungodly men.

8 But forget not this one thing, beloved, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a
9 thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slack

1 Or, *stored with fire.*

heavens' **which are now** is contrasted with *the world that then was.* **Kept in store . . . fire.** The Greek allows 'fire' to be brought in earlier; thus, as in the Revised Version, *stored up for fire*, or stored up *with* fire. **Reserved**—or, *being* reserved (while they are reserved). See upon ver. 10. This, with the related statements in ver. 10, 12, 13, is an instance of Peter's originality, though remote allusions to the destruction of the earth even by fire, as connected with God's coming to punish, are numerous. (Ps. 50: 3; 97: 3; 102: 26; Isa. 34: 4; 51: 6; 66: 15.) Such allusion is made in the words of Christ: "Heaven and earth shall pass away" (Matt. 24: 35), by the writer of Hebrews (12: 26, 27), and by Paul. (2 Thes. 1: 8.) Very striking is the implication in Isa. 66: 22.

This representation of the certainty of the world's destruction appears to be confirmed by recent scientific conclusions. "Our earth is approaching a finality through various causes of change. Its surface is wearing out, and its lands becoming sea-sediments. Its progressive refrigeration will result in the complete absorption of atmosphere and water. Tidal action will slacken the rate of rotation until each side is turned alternately two weeks toward the scorching sun, and two weeks toward the cold regions of space. If this is not enough, the sun is destined to be extinguished, and the earth to be precipitated upon the central funeral pile of our system. Any one of these contingencies demonstrates that the duration of the habitable globe is limited." (Alexander Winchell, LL.D., Professor, University of Michigan, "Journal of Christian Philosophy," Vol. I, No. 3.) "We can see distinctly many causes in operation which must finally result in an entire change of conditions for the earth, and ultimately, unless the course of affairs is somehow arrested in a way we cannot even guess at now, must terminate in its lifelessness or destruction." (C. A. Young, LL. D., Professor, Princeton College, *idem*, Vol. I, No. 2.) Says the same distinguished astronomer, when speaking of the one solar problem, 'which excites the deepest and most general interest"—"that relating to the solar heat"—"I perceive no reason to doubt the final cessation of the sun's activity, and the consequent death of the system." ("Christian Thought.") The gradual shrinking of the earth's orbit, and *the falling of the earth upon the sun*, millions of millions of years from the present, seems to be a necessary result of certain existing conditions. It is added that "almost certainly one thing, of great and decisive importance to the planetary system, will happen before the earth has approached the sun a single mile under this meteoric action."

But the reason why the heavens and the earth are reserved is yet to be stated: they are reserved with reference to the day of judgment, and of the destruction of godless men. The day of judgment will indeed be the day of perdition (destruction, not annihilation) for the godless.

8. The apostle proves from the nature of the divine mind in relation to time, that the objection of the scoffers (ver. 4) is groundless. They say: *All things so continue from the beginning of creation;* there has been delay in Christ's coming, and the delay has been so great that we have the right to believe that Christ will never come at all But, says the apostle, the Lord's conception of duration is such that the argument from long delay is without force. To his infinite mind a thousand years are as one day: not that even the Lord sees no more duration in a thousand years than he sees in one day, but so far as respects the accomplishment of his purposes, a thousand years' delay is no more to him than one hour's delay. The first part of the reply, **one day as a thousand years,** was doubtless suggested to the apostle by Ps. 90: 4 (perhaps he intended it as a quotation); but not seeming to be a pertinent reply to the skeptics, he adds, as his own conception, **a thousand years as one day.** Peter's estimate of this view is such that he gives it much prominence in the words, **this one thing,** and also in the emphatic position which he gives them. In

9 The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.
10 But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with

concerning his promise, as some count slackness; but is longsuffering to you-ward, not wishing that any should perish, but that all should come to re-
10 pentance. But the day of the Lord will come as a thief; in the which the heavens shall pass away

the Greek, thus: *But this one thing* permit not to be hidden from you (do not lose sight of it).

9. That there has been delay in the fulfillment of the promise is clear; but has this delay been of the nature of dilatoriness? Has the Lord shown slackness? Slackness is the result of indifference or of inability; has the delay resulted from either? **Not slack**, says our apostle with characteristic positiveness. Man has not the "*standard*" time. **As some men count slackness**—not *as some think it* (the delay) *to be slackness*, but as some *judge what slackness is.* Some think delay to be slackness; not by such a "standard" is God to be judged. Is the delay, then, the result of arbitrariness? May not the Lord have some benevolent end in view? **Long-suffering.** God's tender forbearance toward men is the true explanation. (1 Pet. 3: 20; Luke 18: 7.) **To us-ward**—toward *you*, according to the better reading, 'you' referring to the readers; but as the remainder of the verse refers to men in general, it is most natural to suppose that these also are included. **Not willing.** *Purposing* that none shall perish would be neither a fair expression of the meaning, nor a justifiable inference. The original expresses inclination, disposition. God's disposition is such that he has no desire in itself that men perish; and hence, to affirm, as does the theological system of Dr. Emmons, that God creates sinful volitions in men (in Pharaoh, for example) for the purpose of "damning" them, is untrue, and in the highest degree derogatory to the character of God. Peter here has nothing to say concerning that eternal and loving purpose by which the sufferings of the Son are prevented from being borne in vain; but he is accounting for the delay of Christ's coming to judge the world. The judgment is delayed, in order that, if possible, all men may be saved. If men are lost before Christ comes, it is not because no opportunity to be saved is given them. **Should come**—to repentance; should *enter into* repentance. And by 'repentance' is meant a change of mind, and also a corresponding change of conduct, and in relation to God not less than in relation to men. The attempt has been made to apply the last clause to the elect, thus: not willing that any of the elect should perish, but that all of them should enter into repentance. Theology must not attempt to overmaster interpretation; nor will Scriptural theology make the attempt. The words cannot be restricted to the elect. Compare Mark 16: 15; 1 Tim. 2: 4; Ezek. 18: 23; 33: 11. The reference to men in general is so much more natural that it is to be preferred. Disharmony between the view which the apostle gives here and that in 1 Pet. 1: 2 cannot be shown. The lesson from this verse is twofold: encouragement to Christians—for the delay does not spring from dilatoriness; and to all men—for it gives opportunity for repentance.

10. But the day of the Lord will come warns against the presumption that in consequence of the long-suffering of God the coming of Christ may never occur. The emphasis is remarkable: *But come will* the day of the Lord. It is possible that *but* was intended to direct back to ver. 4. The scoffers say: '*Where?*' '*But*,' says the apostle, 'that day will come.' 'The day of the Lord'; a striking expression, since all days are days of the Lord In ver. 12 it is called 'the day of *God*,' yet God's day is the day of the coming of Christ. (Ver. 4.) See James 5: 7; 2 Thess. 2: 2. ("The day of *Christ.*") The phrase was used in the times of the prophets. (Joel 1: 15; Ezek. 13: 5; Isa. 2: 12.) To the elect the day of the Lord will be resplendent with joy; to scoffers and sleepers a day of dismay and despair. **As a thief**—unexpectedly and suddenly. Our apostle's Divine Teacher used the same comparison (Matt. 24: 43, 44); and Paul. (1 Thess. 5: 2.) To those who live in continual expectation of the coming of Christ, that coming cannot be sudden (1 Thess. 5: 4); and in that state of expectancy it is most precious to be. A name to live while one is dead will make Christ's coming like the coming of a thief. (Rev. 3: 3.) See the letter to the Church in Sardis. **In the night**—the Greek not found

a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up.
11 *Seeing* then *that* all these things shall be dissolved, what manner *of persons* ought ye to be in *all* holy conversation and godliness,

with a great noise, and the [1] elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat, and the earth and the
11 works that are therein shall be [2] burned up. Seeing that these things are thus all to be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in *all* holy
12 living and godliness, looking for and [3] earnestly

1 Or, *heavenly bodies*.....2 The most ancient manuscripts read *discovered*.....3 Or, *hastening*.

in the best manuscripts. **In the which**—in the which *day*. **The heavens**—the visible heavens surrounding the earth **Will pass away**—compare comments on ver. 13. **With a great noise**—the rendering of but one word (an adverb), and used in the New Testament by Peter only (ῥοιζηδόν). Farrar ("Early Days of Christianity") gives it the remarkable rendering, *hurtlingly!* The Revised Version adheres to the more simple rendering of the Common Version. Like *rasp*, *rattling*, and many other words, the sound of the Greek word, in pronunciation, corresponds with the sound of the act intended to be expressed. The English seems to have no word which is like it in both sense and sound. "The crackling of destructive fire," "the noise of falling houses," "crashing roar," have all been suggested as expressive of the sense. **The elements**—"the component parts of the physical world" (Robinson); perhaps, as some say, *the stars*, *sun*, *and moon*. Revision, in the margin, "Or, *heavenly bodies*." **Shall melt,** etc.—literally, *the elements being burnt, shall be dissolved;* that is, they shall be destroyed by being burnt. **The works that are therein**—both the works of man, and the natural material found upon and within the earth. "This grand epoch in the physical world, represented by the burning of the earth and the melting of the elements, preparatory to a new cycle of the divine manifestations, which the glorified will see, but which it is not permitted us to understand, is connected with the coming of Christ. the resurrection of the dead, and the final judgment." Professor Samuel Harris, D. D., LL. D. ("Bib. Sac.," Jan., 1873). There is in the text no intimation that these great events are to be followed by a millennium. Compare 2 Tim. 4: 1. The wide prevalence of Christianity, with the consequent prevalence of holiness and peace, is to precede the dissolution of the earth, the resurrection, and the general judgment. One of the theories of the premillenial advent of Christ is "that the righteous dead will be raised, living believers changed, and yet the race be continued by natural generation; all, or nearly all, who are born, being converted in early life. In the millennium, therefore, Christ will reign with his saints in their glorified bodies over the race of mankind in their natural bodies. It" [the above view] "is inconsistent with the language of Peter. (2 Pet. 3: 10-13.) For this language predicts such a dissolving of the earth by fire as will make it a new earth, if the new earth be not rather wholly distinct from it." (President Hovey.)

11. Seeing, etc.—literally, *all these things dissolving*, in view of the fact that they *are dissolving*, the apostle conceives the change as even now in the process of accomplishment; either, 1. Because dissolution is inherent in the nature of things (Winer), or, 2. Because God, having willed it, it is certain to occur. Winer gives the participle (λυομένων) the sense of the present. Buttmann would justify the Revisers; for he says that present participles are frequently used in a future sense, and adduces this very case. (§ 137, p. 206.) The word here translated 'dissolved' is the same as is rendered in ver. 10 'shall melt.' The researches of modern science afford a striking confirmation of those inspired representations. See the citations in the comments on ver. 7. **What manner**—possibly a question, perhaps an exclamation. Assuming the former, some make the question end at **be,** and consider all that follows to the end of ver. 12 as the answer; but others extend the question to **godliness.** 'What manner' refers to quality of Christian character. **Ought**—here the obligation seems to be put only on the ground of the dissolution of the earth; but the context shows that with this are connected the other great final events, including (ver. 14) even their own entrance into the peace and purity of heaven. **Holy conversation and godliness.** The Greek words are in the plural: all *forms* of holy deportment and piety. Query: How much are the people of God to-day incited by such a motive to seek such a character?

12 Looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat?
13 Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.
14 Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless.
15 And account *that* the longsuffering of our Lord *is* salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you;

12 desiring the [1]coming of the day of God, by reason of which the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the [2]elements shall melt with fervent
13 heat? But, according to his promise, we look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.
14 Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for these things, give diligence that ye may be found in peace,
15 without spot and blameless in his sight. And account that the longsuffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also, accord-

1 Gr. *presence*.....2 Or, *heavenly bodies*.

12. Looking for—expecting it. **Hasting unto**—*hastening*. The Greek has no word for 'unto.' See Matt. 22: 42, 44; 1 Thess. 1: 10. The readers are exhorted *to hasten the coming*, etc. The day was fixed in the purpose of God; yet, by constant growth in holiness (ver. 18), and by effort, in accordance with God's long-suffering (ver. 9), to turn men to Christ, they are to hasten its coming. Compare Phil. 3: 20; Tit. 2: 13. As always, so here, the point of harmony between God's purpose and man's activity eludes us. **Wherein**—on account of which day, or, perhaps, on account of the coming of which day. The meaning is, that the coming of the day will be *the occasion* of the destruction of the heavens and the earth. As to the remainder, see on ver. 10.

13. Nevertheless expresses the contrast too strongly; *but* is preferable **New heavens and a new earth** is put first in the Greek for emphasis; but new heavens and earth new, according to his promise, we look for. **Promise.** (Isa. 65: 17; 66: 22.) **Righteousness**—to the exclusion forever of all unrighteousness is certainly implied. It cannot, therefore, refer to the condition of human society on earth, after the supposed second advent of Christ, during what some regard as the Millennium; for Premillenarianism teaches that toward the end of the period unrighteousness will again arise. 'New heavens and a new earth'—a figurative representation of the resurrection bliss of that heaven to which Christ ascended, where he now is, and will be forever. There is, neither here nor elsewhere in the Epistles of Peter, evidence that the earth, after its destruction, will be refitted as a dwelling-place for the elect. Innumerable passages show that heaven has already an actual existence, and the supposition that that will be deserted for another, or that there will be at length two heavens, the one there and the other here, is groundless. That heaven, strictly so called, is now elsewhere. See, among many other passages, Matt. 6: 9; John 14: 2, 3; 16: 28; 17: 24; Acts 7: 56; Phil. 1: 23; 1 Tim. 6: 7.

14. Wherefore—a sign of inference. *In view* of what is said in the preceding verse as the object of their expectation. **Seeing that ye look**—*looking for*, *expecting*—the same form as in ver. 12. **Be diligent** (*earnest*), as in 1: 10, 15; translated in Hebrews, "let us labor." **That ye may be found of him.** What Peter meant to express by the pronoun is not clear. The meaning will depend on the connection supposed to exist. Does he mean to say, *blameless by him?* or, *may be found by him?* The former, probably. But possibly the rendering should be, *for him.* Consult Winer § 31, 10, p. 219, and Buttmann § 133, p. 179, and § 134, p. 187. It is rendered in the Revised Version, "*in his sight*," and is connected with *blameless*. Notice the doubleness of the motive: 1. The dissolution of the earth (ver. 11); 2. The possession of a new earth. (Ver. 13.) **In peace.** Compare John 14: 27. How different with the wicked, first in this life (Isa. 57: 20, 21), and then in the next! (Rev. 14: 11.) Sorrow over the immoralities and errors of men, and even indignation at the more Satanic forms of sin, are possible in connection with habitual desire to be found by Christ in peace.

15. The long-suffering—already referred to in ver. 9. **Is salvation**—equivalent to salvation, for it gives them time to make their calling and election sure. (1: 10.) Such delay for such a purpose is not, however, absolutely necessary; otherwise the converted robber (Luke 23: 40-43) needed more evidence that he would be saved than his brief period of repentance gave him. Very beautiful and magnanimous is the reference to Paul, and the more so inasmuch as Peter was once the object of Paul's rebuke. (Gal. 2: 11, 12.) Peter's

cording to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you;
16 As also in all *his* epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as *they do* also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction.
17 Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know *these things* before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness.
16 ing to the wisdom given to him, wrote unto you; as also in all *his* epistles, speaking in them of these things; wherein are some things hard to be understood, which the ignorant and unstedfast wrest, as *they do* also the other scriptures, unto their own
17 destruction. Ye therefore, beloved, knowing *these things* beforehand, beware lest, being carried away with the error of the wicked, ye fall from your own
18 stedfastness. But grow in the grace and knowledge

fault was serious, and had not God already raised up a man having broad views and a decided will, and had Peter been willful and stubborn, it is impossible to say what harm the infant religion might not have suffered. A note in the Douay Version calls Peter's act "only a certain imprudence"; which is intended to save the reputation of "the founder" of the Romish Church, but, as it detracts proportionally from the value of Peter's allusion to Paul, little is gained for "the founder." **Wisdom given him**—partly natural, chiefly supernatural. **Hath written**—*wrote.* **Unto you.** See 1: 1. What epistle or epistles Peter means cannot be determined. It has been assumed by too many that he must refer to an epistle sent to Christians of Asia Minor; but the present Epistle was not sent to them alone, but to all who had obtained like precious faith. The epistle or epistles intended may have been written to the Ephesians or to the Colossians, but they must be presumed to have come into circulation among those to whom Peter's Second Epistle was sent. This supposition will explain the 'you.'

16. All his epistles. Probably all Paul's epistles were written before this time, and most of them must have attained circulation among other churches besides those to which they were sent. Nearly all of them touch some of the subjects which Peter presents, and some make extended allusion to them. **In which**—either among *which things*, or, with another form of the Greek pronoun (more probably correct), *in which epistles.* **Hard to be understood**—not only some things which are common to Paul and Peter, but some things which only Paul has presented. See for example, the 9th chapter of Romans; 1 Cor. 15; 2 Cor. 12: 1-7; Gal. 3: 24-28; 4: 21-31; 1 Thess. 4: 13-17; 2 Thess. 2: 1-12; and, assuming that Paul wrote it, many things in Hebrews. A book professing to be from a Being of infinite wisdom, yet with nothing in it which needs to be *studied*, nothing which, even with hard study, could not be understood in this life, might be presumed to be more human than divine. The Scriptures, as a whole, are easy to be understood—much easier to most men than books originated with men themselves upon philosophy and law. **Unlearned**—not learned in spiritual truth. **Unstable.** See on 2: 14. The adjectives have but one article; they apply, therefore, to the same class of persons. Ignorance and instability—a well-matched pair, but bad for good service. Knowledge of divine things the best foundation. **Wrest**—by perverting the meaning, which is often done. **The other scriptures.** The article points, apparently, to all the current sacred writings in addition to Paul's—that is, to the Old Testament, the Gospels, the Acts, and perhaps Peter's First Epistle. **Unto** indicates result. **Their own destruction.** Eternal punishment (Matt. 25: 46), is *the result* to which their perversion of the Scriptures leads. In attempting to destroy the Bible men destroy themselves.

17, 18. These verses condense the exhortation which runs through the Epistle. In the beginning the apostle desires that *grace* may be multiplied unto them through the *knowledge* of God, and here, at the end, he exhorts them *to grow* in grace and knowledge. **Therefore**—in view of all that I have said. **Seeing ye know**—*knowing;* the same form of expression as in ver. 11, 14. 'Know.' What? For no object is expressed in the original. Know that lustful mockers are to come. (Ver. 3.) They know it *beforehand*, before they come; for they learn it through this very Epistle. Peter's prophecy will not fail, for it is Christ who speaks through him. **Ye also.** 'Also' has no corresponding word in the original, and it makes the contrast between the readers and others too great. **Error.** See on the same word. (2: 18.) **The wicked**—*the lawless*, as in 2: 7. **Fall from**—a warning against apostasy. See Query, at the close of comments on 2: 22. **Your own steadfast-**

18 But grow in grace, and *in* the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him *be* glory both now and for ever. Amen.

of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him *be* the glory both now and [1] for ever. Amen.

1 Gr. *unto the day of eternity.*

ness—not originating with them, for that general virtue is not less the fruit of the Holy Spirit than particular virtue. (Gal. 5: 22, 23.) A quiet contrast between their own steadfastness and the instability of those mentioned in ver. 16 may be intended. Steadfastness is not merely continued adherence to the Church, its creeds and rites; but, while including that, adherence to Christ in spiritual life. **But grow**—not *fall from* (ver. 17), but on the contrary, *grow*. Satisfaction with present attainments may prove the beginning of a fall; growth is the only security. **Grace**—holiness, but with reference to its origin as a gift of unmerited mercy, and here called the grace of Christ. **Knowledge.** *Grow in grace and in the knowledge.* The repetition of *in* before knowledge, and the use of the article in the one case, and not in the other, has the effect to separate growing in grace too widely from growing in knowledge: in *the grace and knowledge* is better. Growth in the knowledge of Christ is indispensable to growth in the grace of Christ. Ignorance cuts the sinews of spiritual growth. INFERENCE: The more knowledge ministers have the better for their people, as well as for themselves; the more they have, the more, in that respect, are they like God. The church which cares little whether its religious teacher be well furnished with knowledge, dishonors the all-knowing Saviour more than words can express. Preaching which is not instructive, but "saws the air too much," "tearing a passion to tatters," and "o'ersteps the modesty of nature"; preaching which is "overdone or come tardy off," "making the unskillful laugh and the judicious grieve"—"pray you avoid it."

The doxology. See on 1 Peter 1: 3; 4: 11. The form here employed varies from that found in 1 Pet. 4: 11. It is, literally: *To whom the glory both now and unto the day of eternity.* The remarkable combination of *day and eternity* may have been unconsciously suggested to the writer by what he had already said in ver. 8. Bengel: "Eternity is a *day*, without night, unmixed and perpetual." Hutter: "The day in which eternity begins as contrasted with time, but which day is also eternity itself." **Amen.** See on 1 Pet. 4: 11.

CRITICAL NOTE.—CHAPTER III.

Says Winer: "In 2 Pet. 3: 6, ὕδατι [*water*] would not be superfluous, even if ὑδάτων were supplied with δι' ὧν [whereby]; it would designate water as an element, whereas ὕδατα (comp. Gen. 7: 11) would signify the concrete (separate) bodies of water. Comp. further Jude 4."

FAMILY OF FAITH COLLEGE LIBRARY
American Commentary on the New Testame
BS2341.H6 vol.6
3480400005698